

# Finite-valued Streaming String Transducers

Emmanuel Filiot (Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)  
 Ismaël Jecker (Université de Besançon, France)  
 Gabriele Puppis (University of Udine, Italy)  
 Christof Löding (RWTH Aachen University, Germany)  
 Anca Muscholl (LaBRI, Université Bordeaux, France)  
 Sarah Winter (IRIF, Université Paris Cité, France)

## Abstract

A transducer is finite-valued if for some bound  $k$ , it maps any given input to at most  $k$  outputs. For classical, one-way transducers, it is known since the 80s that finite valuedness entails decidability of the equivalence problem. This decidability result is in contrast to the general case, which makes finite-valued transducers very attractive. For classical transducers it is also known that finite valuedness is decidable and that any  $k$ -valued finite transducer can be decomposed as a union of  $k$  single-valued finite transducers.

In this paper, we extend the above results to copyless streaming string transducers (SSTs), answering questions raised by Alur and Deshmukh in 2011. SSTs strictly extend the expressiveness of one-way transducers via additional variables that store partial outputs. We prove that any  $k$ -valued SST can be effectively decomposed as a union of  $k$  (single-valued) deterministic SSTs. As a corollary, we obtain equivalence of SSTs and two-way transducers in the finite-valued case (those two models are incomparable in general). Another corollary is an elementary upper bound for checking equivalence of finite-valued SSTs. The latter problem was already known to be decidable, but the proof complexity was unknown (it relied on Ehrenfeucht’s conjecture). Finally, our main result is that finite valuedness of SSTs is decidable. The complexity is PSPACE, and even PTIME when the number of variables is fixed.

## 1 Introduction

Finite-state word transducers are simple devices that allow effective reasoning about data transformations. In their most basic form, they transform words using finite control. For example, the oldest transducer model, known as *generalized sequential machine*, extends deterministic finite state automata by associating each **input** with a corresponding **output** that is generated by appending finite words specified along the transitions. This rather simple model of transducer is capable of representing basic partial functions between words, e.g. the left rotating function  $a_1 a_2 \dots a_n \mapsto a_2 \dots a_n a_1$ . Like automata, transducers can also be enhanced with non-determinism, as well as the ability of scanning the input several times (*two-wayness*). For example, the non-deterministic counterpart of *generalized sequential machines*, called here *one-way transducers*, can be used to represent the right rotating function  $a_1 \dots a_{n-1} a_n \mapsto a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$ , but also word relations that are not partial functions, like for instance the relation that associates an input  $a_1 \dots a_n$  with any output from  $\{a_1\}^* \dots \{a_n\}^*$ . Similarly, deterministic *two-way transducers* can compute the mirror function  $a_1 \dots a_n \mapsto a_n \dots a_1$ , the squaring function  $w \mapsto ww$ , etc.

Inspired by a logic-based approach applicable to arbitrary relational structures [13], *MSO-definable word transductions* were considered by Engelfriet and Hoogetboom [19] and shown to be equivalent to deterministic *two-way transducers*. Ten years later Alur and Cerný [2] proposed *streaming string transducers* (SSTs for short), a *one-way* model that uses write-only variables as additional storage. In SSTs, variables store strings and can be updated by appending or prepending strings, or concatenated together, but not duplicated (they are copyless). Alur and Cerný also showed that, in the *functional* case, that is, when restricting to transducers

that represent partial functions, SSTs are equivalent to the model studied in [19], and thus in particular to **two-way transducers**. These equivalences between transducer models motivate nowadays the use of the term “regular” word function, in the spirit of classical results on regular word languages from automata theory and logics due to Büchi, Elgot, Trakhtenbrot, Rabin, and others.

If, on the one hand, transducers inherit non-determinism and **two-wayness** from automata, on the other hand, these features do not have the same impact on the expressive power as for automata. Specifically, it is known that adding non-determinism and **two-wayness** to finite state automata does not affect the expressive power, as it only makes them more succinct in terms of number of states, and does not affect decidability of fundamental problems either (of course, due to succinctness, some problems may become computationally harder). In contrast, for transducers, the presence of non-determinism and/or **two-wayness** heavily affects the expressive power. For example, non-deterministic **one-way transducers** may capture relations that are not partial functions, and thus not computable by **generalized sequential machines**. This difference is also apparent at the level of the decidability of important problems. For example, the **equivalence problem** is in NLOGSPACE for **generalized sequential machines**, and undecidable for **one-way transducers** [22, 28, ?]. We should also mention that in the **functional** case it is possible to convert one transducer model to another (e.g. convert an SST to an **equivalent two-way transducer**). In the non-functional case, the picture is less satisfactory. In particular, non-deterministic SSTs and non-deterministic **two-way transducers** turn out to be incomparable: for example, the relation  $\{(uv, vu) : u, v \in \Sigma^*\}$  can be represented in the former model but not in the latter, while the relation  $\{(w, w^n) : w \in \Sigma^*, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  can be represented in the latter model but not in the former. However, SSTs can still be converted to **equivalent non-deterministic MSO transductions** [5], which extend the original **MSO transductions** by existentially quantified monadic parameters.

There is however a class of relations that is almost as nice as (regular) word functions: this is the class of **finite-valued** relations, namely, relations that associate a uniformly bounded number of **outputs** with each **input**. The idea of bounding the number of outputs associated with each **input** in a transducer is closely related to that of bounding the number of **accepting runs**, which is commonly known as **finite ambiguity**. The degree of **ambiguity** was intensively studied already in the context of formal languages, where it is shown, for instance, that **equivalence** between **unambiguous** automata is decidable in PTIME [?]. In the context of relations, **k-valuedness** and **k-ambiguity** were initially studied in the setting of **one-way transducers**. For example, in [26] it is shown that, for a fixed  $k$ , one can decide in PTIME whether a given **one-way transducer** is **k-valued**. Similarly, **k-valuedness** can be decided in PSPACE for **two-way transducers** and SSTs [5].

It is also clear that every **k-ambiguous one-way transducer** is **k-valued**. Conversely, it was shown that every **k-valued one-way transducer** can be converted to an **equivalent, k-ambiguous** one [43, 44, 40]. This result, even if it deals with a rather simple model of transducer, already uses advanced normalization techniques from automata theory and involves an exponential blow up in the number of states, as shown in the example below.

**Example 1.** Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and consider the relation

$$R_k = \{(w_1 \dots w_n, w_i) : n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i \leq n, w_1, \dots, w_k \in \{0, 1\}^k\}.$$

Examples of pairs in this relation, when  $k = 2$ , are  $(001011, 00)$ ,  $(001011, 10)$ , and  $(001011, 11)$ . For arbitrary  $k$ , the relation  $R_k$  associates at most  $2^k$  outputs with each input (we say it is  $2^k$ -valued). This relation can be realized by **one-way transducers** that exploit non-determinism to guess which block from the input becomes the output. For example, a possible transducer  $T_k$  that realizes  $R_k$  repeatedly consumes blocks of  $k$  bits from the input, without outputting anything, until it non-deterministically decides to copy the next block, and after that it continues consuming the remaining blocks without output. Note that this transducer  $T_k$  has  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  states, it is **finite-valued**, but not **finitely-ambiguous**, since the number of **accepting runs** per input depends on the number  $n$  of blocks in the input and it is thus unbounded. A **finitely-ambiguous** transducer realizing the same relation  $R_k$  can be obtained at the cost of an exponential blow-up in the number of states, for instance by initially guessing and outputting a  $k$ -bit word  $w$  (this requires at least  $2^k$  states), and then verifying that  $w$  occurs as a block of the input.

Because **k-ambiguous** automata can be easily decomposed as finite unions of **unambiguous** automata, the possibility of converting a **k-valued one-way transducer** to a **k-ambiguous** one also entails a decomposition

result of the following form: every  $k$ -valued one-way transducer is equivalent to a finite union of functional one-way transducers. One advantage of this type of decomposition is that it allows to generalize the decidability of the equivalence problem from functional to  $k$ -valued one-way transducers, which brings us back to the original motivation for considering classes of finite-valued relations. As a matter of fact, decidability of the equivalence problem for  $k$ -valued one-way transducers was independently established in [14]. The paper also states that the same techniques can be adapted to show decidability of equivalence for  $k$ -valued two-way transducers as well. Inspired by [14], the equivalence problem was later shown to be decidable also for  $k$ -valued SSTs [35]. However, the decidability results from [14] and [35] rely on the Ehrenfeucht conjecture [1, 23] and therefore provide no elementary upper bounds on the complexity.

Decomposing finite-valued SSTs and deciding finite-valuedness for SSTs were listed as open problems in [5], more than 10 years ago, and are the main contributions of the present paper. Compared to one-way transducers, new challenges arise with SSTs, due to the extra power they enjoy to produce outputs. For example, consider the relation consisting of all pairs of the form  $(w, 0^{n_0} 1^{n_1})$  or  $(w, 1^{n_1} 0^{n_0})$ , where  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , and  $n_b$  ( $b = 0, 1$ ) is the number of occurrences of  $b$  in  $w$ . This relation is 2-valued, and is not realizable by any one-way transducer. On the other hand, the relation is realized by an SST  $T$  with a single state and two variables, denoted  $X_0, X_1$  and both initially empty: whenever  $T$  reads  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , it non-deterministically applies the update  $X_b := b X_b$  or  $X_b := X_b b$  (while leaving  $X_{1-b}$  unchanged); at the end of the input,  $T$  outputs either  $X_0 X_1$  or  $X_1 X_0$ . The ability of SSTs to generate outputs in a non-linear way makes their study challenging and intriguing. To illustrate this, consider a slight modification of  $T$  where  $X_0$  is initialized with 1, instead of the empty word: the new SST is not finite-valued anymore, because upon reading  $0^n$  it could output any word of the form  $0^i 1 0^j$ , with  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $i + j = n$ .

Another open problem was comparing the expressive power of SSTs and two-way transducers in the finite-valued case. It is not hard to see that the standard translation from deterministic two-way transducers to deterministic SSTs also applies to the finite-valued case (cf. second part of the proof of Theorem 2). The converse translation, however, is far more complicated and relies on a decomposition theorem for SSTs, which we establish here.

**Contributions.** The results presented in this paper draw a rather complete picture about finite-valued SSTs, answering several open problems from [5]. First, we show that  $k$ -valued SSTs enjoy the same decomposition property as one-way transducers:

**Theorem 1.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $k$ -valued SST can be effectively decomposed into a union of  $k$  single-valued (or even deterministic) SSTs. The complexity of the construction is elementary.*

An important consequence of the above theorem is the equivalence of SSTs and two-way transducers in the finite-valued setting:

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$  be a finite-valued relation. If  $R$  can be realized by an SST, then an equivalent two-way transducer can be effectively constructed, and vice-versa.*

*Proof.* If  $R$  is realized by an SST  $T$ , then we can apply Theorem 1 to obtain  $k$  unambiguous SSTs  $T_1, \dots, T_k$  whose union is equivalent to  $T$ . From [2] we know that in the functional case, SSTs and two-way transducers are equivalent. Thus, every  $T_i$  can be transformed effectively into an equivalent, even deterministic, two-way transducer. From this we obtain an equivalent  $k$ -ambiguous two-way transducer.

For the converse we start with a  $k$ -valued two-way transducer  $T$  and first observe that we can normalise  $T$  in such a way that the crossing sequences<sup>1</sup> of accepting runs of  $T$  are bounded by a constant linear in the size of  $T$ . Once we work with runs with bounded crossing sequences we can construct an equivalent SST in the same way as we do for deterministic two-way transducers. The idea is that during the run of the SST the variables record the outputs generated by the pieces of runs at the left of the current input position (see e.g. [33, 16] for self-contained proofs).  $\square$

---

<sup>1</sup>A crossing sequence is a standard notion in the theory of finite-state two-way machines [42], and it is defined as the sequence of states in which a given input position is visited by an accepting run of the machine

A second consequence of Theorem 1 is an elementary upper bound for the equivalence problem of finite-valued SSTs [35]:

**Theorem 3.** *The equivalence problem for  $k$ -valued SSTs can be solved with elementary complexity.*

*Proof.* Given two  $k$ -valued SSTs  $T, T'$ , we first decompose them into unions of  $k$  deterministic SSTs  $T_1, \dots, T_k$  and  $T'_1, \dots, T'_k$ , respectively. Finally, [5, Theorem 4.4] shows how to check the equivalence of  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k T_i$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k T'_i$  in PSPACE.  $\square$

Our last, and main, contribution is to establish the decidability of finite valuedness for SSTs:

**Theorem 4.** *Given any SST  $T$ , we can decide in PSPACE if  $T$  is finite-valued, and in PTIME if the number of variables is fixed. Moreover, this problem is at least as hard as the equivalence problem for deterministic SSTs.*

This last result is the most technical one, and requires to reason on particular substructures (**W-patterns**) of SSTs. Such substructures have been already used for **one-way transducers**, but for SSTs genuine challenges arise. The starting point of our proof is a recent result allowing to determine if two runs of an SST are far apart [20]. The proof then relies on identifying suitable patterns and extending techniques from word combinatorics to more involved word inequalities.

Based on the equivalence between SSTs and **two-way transducers** in the finite-valued setting (Theorem 2), and the decidability of finite valuedness for SST (Theorem 4), we exhibit an alternative proof for the following (known) result:

**Corollary 5** ([46]). *Finite valuedness of two-way transducers is decidable in PSPACE.*

Observe also that without the results in this paper, the result of [46] could not help to show Theorem 4, because only the conversion from finite-valued two-way transducers to finite-valued SSTs was known (under the assumption that any input positions is visited a bounded number of times), but not the other way around. Also note that Theorems 1 and 2 together imply a decomposition result for finite-valued two-way transducers.

Similar results can be derived for non-deterministic MSO transductions. More precisely, since SSTs and non-deterministic MSO transductions are equivalent [5], Theorem 4 entails decidability of finite valuedness for non-deterministic MSO transductions as well. Moreover, since in the single-valued case, deterministic SSTs and MSO transductions are equivalent [2], Theorem 1 implies a decomposition result for MSO transductions: any  $k$ -valued non-deterministic MSO transduction can be decomposed as a union of  $k$  (deterministic) MSO transductions. Finally, from Theorem 2, we also get that, under the assumption of finite valuedness, non-deterministic MSO transductions, two-way transducers, and SSTs are equally expressive.

## 2 Preliminaries

For convenience, technical terms and notations in the electronic version of this manuscript are hyper-linked to their definitions (cf. <https://ctan.org/pkg/knowledge>).

Hereafter,  $\mathbb{N}$  (resp.  $\mathbb{N}_+$ ) denotes the set of non-negative (resp. strictly positive) integers, and  $\Sigma$  denotes a generic alphabet.

**Words and relations.** We denote by  $\varepsilon$  the empty word, by  $|u|$  the length of a word  $u \in \Sigma^*$ , and by  $u[i]$  its  $i$ -th letter, for  $1 \leq i \leq |u|$ . We introduce a **convolution** operation on words, which is particularly useful to identify robust and well-behaved classes of relations, as it is done for instance in the theory of automatic structures [8]. For simplicity, we only consider **convolutions** of words of the same length. Given  $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ , with  $|u| = |v|$ , the **convolution**  $u \otimes v$  is a word over  $(\Sigma^2)^*$  of length  $|u| = |v|$  such that  $(u \otimes v)[i] = (u[i], v[i])$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq |u|$ . For example,  $(aba) \otimes (bcc) = (a, b)(b, c)(a, c)$ . As  $\otimes$  is associative, we may write  $u \otimes v \otimes w$  for any words  $u, v, w$ .

A relation  $R \subseteq (\Sigma^*)^k$  is *length-preserving* if  $|u_1| = \dots = |u_k|$  for all  $(u_1, \dots, u_k) \in R$ . A length-preserving relation is *automatic* if the language  $\{u_1 \otimes \dots \otimes u_k \mid (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in R\}$  is recognized by a finite state automaton. A binary relation  $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$  (not necessarily length-preserving) is *k-valued*, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if for all  $u \in \Sigma^*$ , there are at most  $k$  words  $v$  such that  $(u, v) \in R$ . It is *finite-valued* if it is  $k$ -valued for some  $k$ .

**Variable updates.** Fix a finite set of variables  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ , disjoint from the alphabet  $\Sigma$ . A (copyless) *update* is any mapping  $\alpha : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{X})^*$  such that each variable  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  appears *at most once* in the word  $\alpha(X_1) \dots \alpha(X_m)$ . Such an *update* can be morphically extended to words over  $\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{X}$ , by simply letting  $\alpha(a) = a$  for all  $a \in \Sigma$ . Using this, we can compose any two updates  $\alpha, \beta$  to form a new update  $\alpha \beta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{X})^*$ , defined by  $(\alpha \beta)(X) = \beta(\alpha(X))$  for all  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . An update is called *initial* (resp. *final*) if all variables in  $\mathcal{X}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_1\}$ ) are mapped to the empty word. The designated variable  $X_1$  is used to store the final output produced by an SST, as defined in the next paragraph.

**Streaming string transducers.** A (non-deterministic, copyless) *streaming string transducer* (SST for short) is a tuple  $T = (\Sigma, \mathcal{X}, Q, Q_{\text{init}}, Q_{\text{final}}, \Omega, \Delta)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is an alphabet,  $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite set of variables,  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $Q_{\text{init}}, Q_{\text{final}} \subseteq Q$  are the sets of initial and final states,  $\Omega$  is a function from final states to *final updates*, and  $\Delta$  is a finite transition relation consisting of tuples of the form  $(q, a, \alpha, q')$ , where  $q, q' \in Q$  are the source and target states,  $a \in \Sigma$  is an input symbol, and  $\alpha$  is an *update*. We often denote a transition  $(q, a, \alpha, q') \in \Delta$  by the annotated arrow:

$$q \xrightarrow{a/\alpha} q'.$$

The *size*  $|T|$  of an SST  $T$  is defined as the number of states plus the size of its transition relation.

A *run* of  $T$  is a sequence of transitions from  $\Delta$  of the form

$$\rho = q_0 \xrightarrow{a_1/\alpha_1} q_1 \xrightarrow{a_2/\alpha_2} q_2 \dots q_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_n/\alpha_n} q_n.$$

The *input consumed by*  $\rho$  is the word  $\text{in}(\rho) = a_1 \dots a_n$ . The *update induced by*  $\rho$  is the composition  $\beta = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ . We write  $\rho : u/\beta$  to mean that  $\rho$  is a run with  $u$  as *consumed input* and  $\beta$  as *induced update*. A run  $\rho$  as above is *accepting* if the first state is initial and the last state is final, namely, if  $q_0 \in Q_{\text{init}}$  and  $q_n \in Q_{\text{final}}$ . In this case, the *induced update*, extended to the left with the *initial update* denoted by  $\iota$  and to the right with the *final update*  $\Omega(q_n)$ , gives rise to an *update*  $\iota \beta \Omega(q_n)$  that maps  $X_1$  to a word over  $\Sigma$  and all remaining variables to the empty word. In particular, the latter *update* determines the *output produced by*  $\rho$ , defined as the word  $\text{out}(\rho) = (\iota \beta \Omega(q_n))(X_1)$ .

The *relation realized by* an SST  $T$  is

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \{(\text{in}(\rho), \text{out}(\rho)) \in \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \mid \rho \text{ accepting run of } T\}$$

An SST is *k-valued* (resp. *finite-valued*) if its realized relation is so. It is *deterministic* if it has a single initial state and the transition relation is a partial function (from pairs of states and input letters to pairs of updates and states). It is *unambiguous* if it admits at most one accepting run on each input. Similarly, it is called *k-ambiguous* if it admits at most  $k$  accepting runs on each input. Of course, every deterministic SST is unambiguous, and every unambiguous SST is single-valued (i.e. 1-valued). Two SSTs  $T_1, T_2$  are *equivalent* if  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) = \mathcal{R}(T_2)$ . The equivalence problem for SSTs is undecidable in general, and it is so even for one-way transducers [22, 28]. However, decidability is recovered for finite-valued SSTs:

**Theorem 6** ([35]). *Equivalence of finite-valued SSTs is decidable.*

Note that checking equivalence is known to be in PSPACE for *deterministic* SSTs. This easily generalizes to unions of *deterministic* (hence *single-valued*) SSTs, because the equivalence checking algorithm is exponential only in the number of variables:

**Theorem 7** ([5]). *The following problem is in PSPACE:* given  $n + m$  deterministic SSTs  $T_1, \dots, T_n, T'_1, \dots, T'_m$ , decide whether  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(T_i) = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \mathcal{R}(T'_j)$ .

For any fixed  $k$ , the  $k$ -valuedness property is decidable in PSPACE:

**Theorem 8** ([5]). *For any fixed  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following problem is in<sup>2</sup> PSPACE:* given an SST  $T$ , decide whether  $T$  is  $k$ -valued. It is in PTIME if one further restricts to SSTs with a fixed number of variables.

The decidability status of *finite valuedness* for SSTs, that is, for unknown  $k$ , was an open problem. Part of our contribution is to show that this problem is also decidable.

## 2.1 Pumping and word combinatorics

When reasoning with automata, it is common practice to use pumping arguments. This section introduces pumping for SSTs, as well as combinatorial results for reasoning about (in)equalities between pumped outputs of SSTs.

In order to have adequate properties for pumped runs of SSTs, the notion of loop needs to be defined so as to take into account how the content of variables “flows” into other variables when performing an update. We define the *skeleton* of an update  $\alpha : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{X})^*$  as the update  $\hat{\alpha} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^*$  obtained from  $\alpha$  by removing all the letters from  $\Sigma$ . Note that there are only finitely many skeletons, and their composition forms a finite monoid, called the *skeleton monoid* (this is very similar to the flow monoid from [35], but does not rely on any normalization).

A *loop* of a run  $\rho$  of an SST is any factor  $L$  of  $\rho$  that starts and ends in the same state and induces a *skeleton-idempotent* update, namely, an update  $\alpha$  such that  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha\alpha$  have the same skeleton. For example, the update  $\alpha : X_1 \mapsto a X_1 b X_2 c, X_2 \mapsto a$  is *skeleton-idempotent* and thus can be part of a loop. We will often denote a loop in a run by an interval  $[i, j]$ . In this case, it is convenient to assume that the indices  $i, j$  represent “positions” in-between the transitions, thus identifying occurrences of states; in this way, adjacent loops can be denoted by intervals of the form  $[i_1, i_2], [i_2, i_3]$ , etc. In particular, if the run consists of  $n$  transitions, then the largest possible interval on it is  $[0, n]$ . For technical reasons, we do allow *empty* loops, that is, loops of the form  $[i, j]$ , with  $i = j$  and with the induced update being the identity function on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

The run obtained from  $\rho$  by pumping  $n$  times a loop  $L$  is denoted  $\text{pump}_L^n(\rho)$ . If we are given an  $m$ -tuple of pairwise disjoint loops  $\bar{L} = (L_1, \dots, L_m)$  and an  $m$ -tuple of (positive) numbers  $\bar{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_m)$ , then we write  $\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{n}}(\rho)$  for the run obtained by pumping simultaneously  $n_i$  times  $L_i$ , for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

The next lemma is a Ramsey-type argument that, based on the number of states of the SST, the size of the skeleton monoid, and a number  $n$ , derives a minimum length for a run to witness  $n + 1$  points and loops between pairs of any of these points. The reader can refer to [30] to get good estimates of the values of  $E, H$ .

**Lemma 9.** *Given an SST, one can compute two numbers  $E, H$  such that for every run  $\rho$ , every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and every set  $I \subseteq \{0, \dots, |\rho|\}$  of cardinality  $En^H + 1$ , there is a subset  $I' \subseteq I$  of cardinality  $n + 1$  such that for all  $i < j \in I'$  the interval  $[i, j]$  is a loop of  $\rho$ . The values of  $E, H$  are elementary in the size of the SST.*

*Proof.* The paper [30] computes for a given monoid  $M$  an upper bound  $R_M(n)$  such that any sequence from  $M^*$  of length larger than  $R_M(n)$  contains  $n$  consecutive infixes such for some idempotent  $e$  of  $M$  (i.e., satisfying  $ee = e$ ) each such infix multiplies out to  $e$ . In our case, the monoid  $M$  is the product of the monoid  $((Q \times Q) \cup \{0\}, \cdot)$  with  $(p, q) \cdot (q, r) = (p, r)$  (resp.  $(p, q) \cdot (q', r) = 0$  if  $q \neq q'$ ) and the skeleton monoid of the SST. Thus, any infix of the run that multiplies out to an idempotent (after mapping each transition to the corresponding monoid element) corresponds to a loop of the SST. The upper bound  $R_M(n)$  is exponential only in the size of  $M$ .  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>In [5], no complexity result is provided, but the decidability procedure relies on a reduction to the emptiness of a 1-reversal  $k(k + 1)$ -counter machine, based on the proof for equivalence of deterministic SST [3]. The counter machine is exponential in the number of variables only, and the result follows since emptiness of counter machines with fixed number of reversals and fixed number of counters is in NLOGSPACE [24].

Below, we describe the effect on the **output of pumping loops** in a run of an SST. We start with the following simple combinatorial result:

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a skeleton-idempotent update. For every variable  $X$ , there exist two words  $u, v \in \Sigma^*$  such that, for all positive natural numbers  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $\alpha^n(X) = u^{n-1} \alpha(X) v^{n-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{\alpha}$  be the idempotent skeleton of  $\alpha$ . We first prove the following claim:

**Claim.** *For all  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $\hat{\alpha}(X) \neq \varepsilon$ , then  $X$  occurs in  $\alpha(X)$ .*

*Proof of the claim.* The proof is by induction on the number of variables  $X$  such that  $\hat{\alpha}(X) \neq \varepsilon$ . The base case holds vacuously. As for the induction step, fix a variable  $X_0$  such that  $\hat{\alpha}(X_0) \neq \varepsilon$ . We distinguish two cases:

- If  $X_0$  occurs in  $\alpha(X_0)$ , then the claim clearly holds for  $X_0$  and it remains to prove it for all other variables  $Y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_0\}$ . Since  $\alpha$  is copyless,  $X_0$  does not occur in  $\alpha(Y)$ , for all  $Y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_0\}$ . Therefore, the restricted update  $\alpha|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \{X_0\}}$  has an idempotent skeleton, and by the inductive hypothesis it satisfies the claim. From this we immediately derive that the claim also holds for the original update  $\alpha$ .
- If  $X_0$  does not occur in  $\alpha(X_0)$ , then  $\alpha(X_0)$  still contains at least one occurrence of another variable, since  $\hat{\alpha}(X_0) \neq \varepsilon$ . So, suppose that  $\alpha(X_0) = h Y t$  for some  $h, t \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \Sigma)^*$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\alpha$  is skeleton-idempotent, we have  $(\alpha\alpha)(X_0) = \alpha(h) \alpha(Y) \alpha(t) = h' Y t'$  for some  $h', t' \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \Sigma^*)$ . Now, if  $Y$  occurs in  $\alpha(Y)$ , then we can apply the inductive hypothesis on the restriction  $\alpha|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \{Y\}}$ , as in the previous case, and establish the claim. Otherwise, if  $Y$  does not occur in  $\alpha(Y)$ , we reach a contradiction by arguing as follows. Since  $Y$  occurs in  $\alpha(h) \alpha(Y) \alpha(t)$  but not in  $\alpha(Y)$ , then it occurs in  $\alpha(h) \alpha(t)$ . Since  $X_0$  is the unique variable such that  $Y$  occurs in  $\alpha(X_0)$  (because  $\alpha$  is copyless), necessarily  $X_0$  occurs in  $h t$  and hence in  $\alpha(X_0)$  as well, which contradicts the initial assumption.  $\square$

We conclude the proof of the lemma. Let  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . If  $\alpha(X)$  does not contain any variable, then we immediately get the result, as  $\alpha^n(X) = \alpha(X)$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Otherwise, if  $\alpha(X)$  contains some variable, then we know that  $\hat{\alpha}(X) \neq \varepsilon$ , so by the above claim,  $X$  occurs in  $\alpha(X)$ . Hence,  $\alpha(X) = h X t$  for some  $h, t \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \Sigma)^*$ . We now prove that  $\alpha(h) \alpha(t) \in \Sigma^*$ . Indeed, let  $Y$  be any variable in  $h t$  (if there is no such variable then clearly  $\alpha(h) \alpha(t)$  contains no variable either). Since  $\alpha$  is copyless,  $Y$  does not occur in  $\alpha(Y)$ , hence by the above claim (contrapositive),  $\hat{\alpha}(Y) = \varepsilon$ , whence  $\alpha(Y) \in \Sigma^*$ . We then derive  $(\alpha\alpha)(X) = \alpha(h) \alpha(X) \alpha(t)$ , where  $\alpha(h), \alpha(t) \in \Sigma^*$ , and so we can take  $u = \alpha(h)$  and  $v = \alpha(t)$ . To conclude, we have  $\alpha^2(X) = u \alpha(X) v$ , so for  $n > 2$ ,  $\alpha^n(X) = \alpha^{n-2}(\alpha^2(X)) = \alpha^{n-2}(u \alpha(X) v) = u \alpha^{n-1}(X) v$ , as claimed.  $\square$

It follows that **pumping loops** in a run corresponds to introducing repeated copies of factors in the output. Similar results can be found in [35] for SSTs and in [36, 18] for two-way transducers:

**Corollary 11.** *Let  $\rho$  be an accepting run of an SST and let  $\bar{L} = (L_1, \dots, L_m)$  be a tuple of pairwise disjoint loops in  $\rho$ . Then, for some  $r \leq 2m|\mathcal{X}|$  there exist words  $w_0, \dots, w_r, u_1, \dots, u_r$  and indices  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq m$ , not necessarily distinct, such that for every tuple  $\bar{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}_+^m$  of positive natural numbers,*

$$\text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{n}}(\rho)) = w_0 u_1^{n_{i_1}-1} w_1 \dots u_r^{n_{i_r}-1} w_r.$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Lemma 10. Note that the content of any variable  $X$  just after pumping a loop either appears as infix of the final output, or is erased by some later update. In both cases, each pumped loop  $L_i$  induces in the output  $(n_i - 1)$ -folded repetitions of  $2k$  (possibly empty) factors, where  $k$  is the number of variables of the SST. Since the loops are pairwise disjoint, they contribute such factors without any interference. The final output  $\text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{n}}(\rho))$  thus features repetitions of  $r = 2km$  (possibly empty) factors.  $\square$

The rest of the section analyses properties of words with repeated factors like the one in Corollary 11.




Figure 1: Illustration of an argument for the proof of Corollary 13

**Definition 1.** A **word inequality** with repetitions parametrized in  $\mathbf{X}$  is a pair  $e = (w, w')$  of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} w &= s_0 t_1^{x_1} s_1 \dots t_m^{x_m} s_m \\ w' &= s'_0 t_1^{y_1} s'_1 \dots t_n^{y_n} s'_n \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_i, t_i, s'_j, t'_j \in \Sigma^*$  and  $x_i, y_j \in \mathbf{X}$  for all  $i, j$ . The set of **solutions** of  $e = (w, w')$ , denoted  $\text{Sols}(e)$ , consists of the mappings  $f : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f(w) \neq f(w')$ , where  $f(w)$  is the word obtained from  $w$  by substituting every formal parameter  $x \in \mathbf{X}$  by  $f(x)$ , and similarly for  $f(w')$ . A **system of word inequalities** is a non-empty finite set  $E$  of inequalities as above, and its set of solutions is given by  $\text{Sols}(E) = \bigcap_{e \in E} \text{Sols}(e)$ .

The next theorem states that if there exists a solution to a system of inequalities parameterized by a single variable  $x$ , then the set of solutions is co-finite.

**Theorem 12** ([37, Theorem 4.3]). *Given a word inequality  $e$  with repetitions parameterized by single variable  $x$ ,  $\text{Sols}(e)$  is either empty or co-finite; more precisely, if the left (resp. right) hand-side of  $e$  contains  $m$  (resp.  $n$ ) repeating patterns (as in Definition 1), then either  $\text{Sols}(e) = \emptyset$  or  $|\mathbb{N} \setminus \text{Sols}(e)| \leq m + n$ .*

Finally, we present two corollaries of the above theorem, that will be used later. The first corollary concerns **satisfiability** of a system of inequalities. Formally, we say that a word inequality  $e$  (resp. a system of inequalities  $E$ ) is **satisfiable** if its set of solutions is non-empty.

**Corollary 13.** *Let  $E$  be a system of word inequalities. If every inequality  $e \in E$  is satisfiable, then so is the system  $E$ .*

*Proof.* We assume that all inequalities considered hereafter have parameters in  $\mathbf{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . We are going to compare functions from  $\mathbf{X}$  to  $\mathbb{N}$  based on suitable partial orders, each parameterized by a variable. Formally, given two functions  $f, g : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and a variable  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , we write  $f \leq_x g$  iff  $f(x) \leq g(x)$  and  $f(y) = g(y)$  for all  $y \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \{x\}$ . We prove the following two properties (the first property is equivalent to the claim of the lemma):

$$\bigwedge_{e \in E} \exists f \in \text{Sols}(e) \rightarrow \exists g \in \text{Sols}(E) \tag{1}$$

$$\forall f \in \text{Sols}(E) \forall x \in \mathbf{X} \exists g \geq_x f \forall h \geq_x g \ h \in \text{Sols}(E) \tag{2}$$

The proof is by a double induction on the cardinality of  $E$  and the number  $k$  of parameters.

The base case is when  $E$  has cardinality 1. In this case Property (1) holds trivially. We see how Property (2) follows from Theorem 12. Let  $E = \{e\}$ ,  $f \in \text{Sols}(e)$ , and fix an arbitrary variable  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ . We construct the inequality  $e'$  with  $\mathbf{x}$  as single formal parameter, by instantiating in  $e$  every other parameter  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \{\mathbf{x}\}$  with the value  $f(\mathbf{y})$ . By construction,  $f$  restricted to  $\{\mathbf{x}\}$  is a solution of  $e'$ , and thus, by Theorem 12,  $\text{Sols}(e')$  is co-finite. This means that there is a number  $x_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x_0 \geq f(\mathbf{x})$  and, for all  $x_1 \geq x_0$ , the mapping  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto x_1$  is a solution to  $e'$  as well. This property can be transferred to the original inequality  $e$ , as follows. We define  $g = f[\mathbf{x}/x_1]$  as the function obtained from  $f$  by replacing the image of  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $x_1$ . Note that  $g \geq_x f$  and, for all  $h \geq_x g$ ,  $h \in \text{Sols}(e)$ . This proves Property (2).

As for the inductive step, suppose that  $E$  is a system with at least two inequalities, and divide  $E$  into two sub-systems,  $E'$  and  $E''$ , with cardinalities strictly smaller than that of  $E$ .

Let us first prove Property (1) for  $E$ . Suppose that every inequality in  $E$  is satisfiable. By the inductive hypothesis,  $E'$  and  $E''$  are also satisfiable; in particular, there exist solutions  $g'$  and  $g''$  of  $E'$  and  $E''$ , respectively. We proceed with a second induction to prove that, for larger and larger sets of variables  $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , there are solutions of  $E'$  and  $E''$  that agree on all the variables from  $\mathbf{Y}$ , namely:

$$\exists g'_Y \in \text{Sols}(E') \quad \exists g''_Y \in \text{Sols}(E'') \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Y} \quad g'_Y(\mathbf{y}) = g''_Y(\mathbf{y}) . \quad (\star)$$

Of course, for  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}$ , the above property will imply the existence of a solution of  $E$ . The reader can refer to Figure 1 as an illustration of the arguments that follow (axes correspond to variables, and red and blue dots represent solutions of the systems  $E'$  and  $E''$ , respectively).

For  $\mathbf{Y} = \emptyset$ , the claim  $(\star)$  is trivial, since we can simply let  $g'_\emptyset = g'$  and  $g''_\emptyset = g''$ . For the inductive step, suppose that  $(\star)$  holds for  $\mathbf{Y}$  and let us prove it also holds for  $\mathbf{Y}' = \mathbf{Y} \uplus \{\mathbf{x}\}$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $E'$  and  $E''$  satisfy Property (2). In particular, by instantiating  $f$  with  $g'_Y$  (resp.  $g''_Y$ ) in Property (2), we obtain the existence of  $g' \geq_x g'_Y$  such that, for all  $h' \geq_x g'$ ,  $h' \in \text{Sols}(E')$  (resp.  $g'' \geq_x g''_Y$  such that, for all  $h'' \geq_x g''$ ,  $h'' \in \text{Sols}(E'')$ ). Note that the functions  $g'_Y, g''_Y, g', g''$  all agree on the variables from  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Moreover, without loss of generality, we can assume that  $g'$  and  $g''$  also agree on the variable  $\mathbf{x}$ : indeed, if this were not the case, we could simply replace the  $\mathbf{x}$ -images of  $g'$  and  $g''$  with  $\max\{g'(\mathbf{x}), g''(\mathbf{x})\}$ , without affecting the previous properties. Property  $(\star)$  now follows from letting  $g'_{Y'} = g'$  and  $g''_{Y'} = g''$ . This concludes the proof of the inductive step for Property (1).

Let us now prove the inductive step for Property (2). Let  $f$  be a solution of  $E$  and let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ . Since both  $E'$  and  $E''$  satisfy Property (2) and since  $f \in \text{Sols}(E') \cap \text{Sols}(E'')$ , there are  $g', g'' \geq_x f$  such that, for all  $h' \geq_x g'$  and  $h'' \geq_x g''$ ,  $h' \in \text{Sols}(E')$  and  $h'' \in \text{Sols}(E'')$ . Since  $g', g'' \geq_x f$ ,  $g'$  and  $g''$  agree on all variables, except possibly  $\mathbf{x}$ . Without loss of generality, we can also assume that  $g'$  and  $g''$  agree on  $\mathbf{x}$ : as before, if this were not the case, we could replace the  $\mathbf{x}$ -images of  $g'$  and  $g''$  with  $\max\{g'(\mathbf{x}), g''(\mathbf{x})\}$ , while preserving the previous properties. Now that we have  $g' = g''$ , we can use this function to witness Property (2), since, for all  $h \geq_x g' (= g'')$ , we have  $h \in \text{Sols}(E') \cap \text{Sols}(E'') = \text{Sols}(E)$ .  $\square$

The second corollary is related to the existence of large sets of solutions for a satisfiable word inequality that avoid any correlation between variables. To formalize the statement, it is convenient to fix a total order on the variables of the inequality, say  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ , and then identify every function  $f : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  with the  $k$ -tuple of values  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , where  $x_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . According to this correspondence, the corollary states the existence of sets of solutions that look like Cartesian products of finite intervals of values, each with arbitrarily large cardinality. The statement of the corollary is in fact slightly more complicated than this, as it discloses dependencies between the intervals. We also observe that the order in which we list the variables is arbitrary, but different orders will induce different dependencies between intervals.

**Corollary 14.** *Let  $e$  be a word inequality with repetitions parametrized in  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$ . If  $e$  is satisfiable, then*

$$\exists \ell_1 \forall h_1 \dots \exists \ell_k \forall h_k \quad \underbrace{[\ell_1, h_1]}_{\text{values for } \mathbf{x}_1} \times \dots \times \underbrace{[\ell_k, h_k]}_{\text{values for } \mathbf{x}_k} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e).$$




Figure 2: Illustration of an argument for the proof of Corollary 14

*Proof.* Let  $e$  be a **satisfiable word inequality** parametrized in  $\mathbf{X}$  and let  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  be any **solution** of  $e$ . We will prove the following claim by induction on  $i = 0, \dots, k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \ell_1 \forall h_1 \dots \exists \ell_i \forall h_i \\ [l_1, h_1] \times \dots \times [l_i, h_i] \times \{x_{i+1}\} \times \dots \times \{x_k\} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e) \end{aligned} \quad (\star)$$

Note that for  $i = k$  the above claim coincides with the statement of the corollary. The reader can also refer to Figure 2 as an illustration of the arguments that follow (axes correspond to variables  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$ , dots represent generic **solutions** of  $e$ , clusters of black dots represent solutions in the form of Cartesian products, like those that appear in  $(\star)$ ).

For the base case  $i = 0$ , the claim  $(\star)$  is vacuously true, as  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is a **solution** of  $e$ .

For the inductive step, we need to show that if  $(\star)$  holds for  $i < k$ , then it also holds for  $i + 1$ . It is in fact sufficient to prove that, for  $i < k$ , It is in fact sufficient to prove that, for  $i < k$ ,

$$[l_1, h_1] \times \dots \times [l_i, h_i] \times \{x_{i+1}\} \times \dots \times \{x_k\} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e)$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \ell_{i+1} \forall h_{i+1} \\ [l_1, h_1] \times \dots \times [l_{i+1}, h_{i+1}] \times \{x_{i+2}\} \times \dots \times \{x_k\} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e). \end{aligned}$$

For brevity, we let  $S = [l_1, h_1] \times \dots \times [l_i, h_i] \times \{x_{i+1}\} \times \dots \times \{x_k\}$ , and we assume that  $S \subseteq \text{Sols}(e)$ . For every tuple  $\bar{s} \in S$ , we consider the **word inequality**  $e_{\bar{s}}$  over a single variable  $x_{i+1}$  that is obtained from  $e$  by instantiating every other variable  $x_j$  ( $j \neq i$ ) with  $\bar{s}[j]$ . Since  $S \subseteq \text{Sols}(e)$ , we know that  $e_{\bar{s}}$  is **satisfiable**, and hence by Theorem 12,  $e_{\bar{s}}$  has co-finitely many **solutions**. This means that there is  $\ell_{\bar{s}}$  such that, for all  $x' \geq \ell_{\bar{s}}$ ,  $x'$  is also a **solution** of  $e_{\bar{s}}$ . This property can be transferred to our original **inequality**  $e$ :

**Claim.** For every  $\bar{s} \in S$ , there is  $\ell_{\bar{s}}$  such that, for every  $x' \geq \ell_{\bar{s}}$ , the tuple  $\bar{s}[i + 1 \mapsto x']$ , obtained from  $\bar{s}$  by replacing the  $(i + 1)$ -th value with  $x'$ , is a **solution** of  $e$ .

Now, the existentially quantified value  $\ell_{i+1}$  can be set to the maximum of the  $\ell_{\bar{s}}$ 's, for all  $\bar{s} \in S$  (for this definition to make sense, it is crucial that the set  $S$  is finite). In this way, thanks to the previous claim, the

containment  $[\ell_1, h_1] \times \cdots \times [\ell_{i+1}, h_{i+1}] \times \{x_{i+2}\} \times \cdots \times \{x_k\} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e)$  holds for all choices of the universally quantified value  $h_{i+1}$ . This proves the inductive step for  $(\star)$  from  $i$  to  $i + 1$ .  $\square$

## 2.2 Delay between accepting runs

We briefly recall the definitions from [20] and introduce a measure of similarity (called **delay**) between **accepting runs** of an SST that have the same **input** and the same **output**.

We first give some intuition, followed by definitions and an example. Naturally, the difference between the amount of output symbols produced during a run should be an indicator of (dis)similarity. However, as SSTs do not necessarily build their output from left to right, one must also take into account the position where an output symbol is placed. For example, compare two runs  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  on the same **input** that produce the same **output**  $aaabbb$ . After consuming a prefix of the input,  $\rho$  may have produced  $aaa\_ \_ \_$  and  $\rho'$  may have produced  $\_ \_ \_ bbb$ . The amount of produced output symbols is the same, but the runs are delayed because  $\rho$  built the **output** from the left, whereas  $\rho'$  did it from the right. This idea of **delay** comes with an important caveat. As another example, consider two runs  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  on the same **input** that produce the same **output**  $aaaaaa$ , and assume that, after consuming the same prefix of the **input**,  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  produced  $aaa\_ \_ \_$  and  $\_ \_ \_ aaa$ , respectively. Note that the **output**  $aaaaaa$  is a periodic word. Hence, it does not matter if  $aaa$  is appended or prepended to a word with period  $a$ . In general, one copes with this phenomenon by dividing the **output** into periodic parts, where all periods are bounded by a well-chosen parameter  $C$ . So, intuitively, the **delay** measures the difference between the numbers of output symbols that have been produced by the two runs, up to the end of each of periodic factor. The number of produced output symbols is formally captured by a **weight** function, defined below, and the **delay** aggregates the **weight** differences.

For an **accepting run**  $\rho$ , a position  $t$  of  $\rho$ , and a position  $j$  in the output  $\text{out}(\rho)$ , we denote by  $\text{weight}_j^t(\rho)$  the number of output positions  $j' \leq j$  that are produced by the prefix of  $\rho$  up to position  $t$ . We use the above notation when  $j$  witnesses a change in a repeating pattern of the output. These changes in repeating patterns are called **cuts**, as formalized below.

Let  $w$  be any non-empty word (e.g. the output of  $\rho$  or a factor of it). The **primitive root** of  $w$ , denoted  $\text{root}(w)$ , is the shortest word  $r$  such that  $w \in \{r\}^*$ . For a fixed integer  $C > 0$  we define a factorization  $w[1, j_1], w[j_1 + 1, j_2], \dots, w[j_{n-1} + 1, j_n]$  of  $w$  in which every  $j_i$  is chosen as the rightmost position for which  $w[j_{i-1} + 1, j_i]$  has **primitive root** of length not exceeding  $C$ . These positions  $j_1, \dots, j_n$  are called  **$C$ -cuts**. More precisely:

- the **first  $C$ -cut** of  $w$  is the largest position  $j \leq |w|$ , such that  $|\text{root}(w[1, j])| \leq C$ ;
- if  $j$  is the  $i$ -th  **$C$ -cut** of  $w$ , then the  $(i + 1)$ -th  **$C$ -cut** of  $w$  is the largest position  $j' > j$  such that  $|\text{root}(w[j + 1, j'])| \leq C$ .

We denote by  $C\text{-cuts}(w)$  the set of all  **$C$ -cuts** of  $w$ .

We are now ready to define the notion of **delay**. Consider two **accepting runs**  $\rho, \rho'$  of an SST with the same **input**  $u = \text{in}(\rho) = \text{in}(\rho')$  and the same **output**  $w = \text{out}(\rho) = \text{out}(\rho')$ , and define:

$$C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') = \max_{\substack{t \leq |u|, \\ j \in C\text{-cuts}(w)}} |\text{weight}_j^t(\rho) - \text{weight}_j^t(\rho')|$$

that is, the maximum, over all prefixes of the runs and all  **$C$ -cuts** of the **output**, of the absolute values of the differences of the corresponding weights in  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$ . Note that the **delay** is only defined for **accepting runs** with same **input** and **output**. So whenever we write  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho')$ , we implicitly mean that  $\rho, \rho'$  have *same input and same output*.

**Example 2.** Let  $w = abccbb$  be the **output** of runs  $\rho, \rho'$  on the same **input** of length 2. Assume  $\rho$  produces  $abc\_bb$  and then  $abccbb$ , whereas  $\rho'$  produces  $\_ \_ \_ cbb$  and then  $abccbb$ . For  $C = 2$ , we obtain  $2\text{-cuts}(w) = \{2, 5, 7\}$ , i.e.,  $w$  is divided into  $ab|cc|bb$ . To compute the  $2\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho')$ , we need to calculate **weights** at **cuts**. For  $t = 0$ ,  $\text{weight}_j^0(\rho) = \text{weight}_j^0(\rho') = 0$  for all  $j \in 2\text{-cuts}(w)$  because nothing has been produced. For  $t = 2$ ,

$\text{weight}_j^2(\rho) = \text{weight}_j^2(\rho') = j$  for all  $j \in 2\text{-cuts}(w)$  because the whole output has been produced. Only the case  $t = 1$  has an impact on the delay. We have  $\text{weight}_2^1(\rho) = 2$ ,  $\text{weight}_5^1(\rho) = 3$ , and  $\text{weight}_7^1(\rho) = 5$ . Also, we have  $\text{weight}_2^1(\rho') = 0$ ,  $\text{weight}_5^1(\rho') = 1$ , and  $\text{weight}_7^1(\rho') = 3$ . Hence, we obtain  $2\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') = 2$ .

We recall below a few crucial results from [20]. A first result shows that the relation of pairs of runs having bounded delay (for a fixed bound) is **automatic** — for this to make sense, we view a run of an SST as a finite word, with letters representing transitions, and we recall that a relation is **automatic** if its **convolution** language is regular.

**Lemma 15** ([20, Theorem 5]). *Given an SST and some numbers  $C, D$ , the relation consisting of pairs of accepting runs  $(\rho, \rho')$  such that  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D$  is automatic.*

*Proof.* The statement in [20, Theorem 5] is not for runs of SSTs, but for sequences of updates. One can easily build an automaton that checks if two sequences of transitions, encoded by their **convolution**, form accepting runs  $\rho, \rho'$  of the given SST on the same input. The remaining condition  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D$  only depends on the underlying sequences of updates determined by  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$ , and can be checked using [20, Theorem 5].  $\square$

A second result shows that given two runs with large delay, one can find a set of positions on the input (the cardinality of which depends on how large the delay is) in such a way that any interval starting just before any of these positions and ending just after any other of these positions is a **loop** on both runs such that, when pumped, produces different outputs. By this last result, large delay intuitively means “potentially different outputs”.

**Lemma 16** ([20, Lemma 6]). *Given an SST, one can compute<sup>3</sup> some numbers  $C, D$  such that, for all  $m \geq 1$  and all runs  $\rho, \rho'$ : if  $Cm\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') > Dm^2$ , then there exist  $m$  positions  $0 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_m \leq |\rho|$  such that, for every  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ , the interval  $L_{i,j} = [\ell_i, \ell_j]$  is a loop on both  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  and satisfies*

$$\text{out}(\text{pump}_{L_{i,j}}^2(\rho)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_{L_{i,j}}^2(\rho')).$$

To reason about **finite valuedness** we will often consider several accepting runs on the same input that have pairwise large delays. By Lemma 16, every two such runs can be pumped so as to witness different outputs. The crux however is to show that these runs can be pumped *simultaneously* so as to get pairwise different outputs. This is indeed possible thanks to:

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $C, D$  be computed as in Lemma 16, and  $k$  be an arbitrary number. Then one can compute a number  $m$  such that, for all runs  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$  on the same input and with  $\bigwedge_{0 \leq i < j \leq k} (\text{out}(\rho_i) \neq \text{out}(\rho_j) \vee Cm\text{-delay}(\rho_i, \rho_j) > Dm^2)$ , there is a tuple  $\bar{L} = (L_{i,j})_{0 \leq i < j \leq k}$  of disjoint intervals that are loops on all runs  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$ , and there is a tuple  $\bar{n} = (n_{i,j})_{0 \leq i < j \leq k}$  of positive numbers such that*

$$\text{for all } 0 \leq i < j \leq k, \quad \text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{n}}(\rho_i)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{n}}(\rho_j)).$$

*Proof.* We first define  $m$ . Let  $E, H$  be as in Lemma 9, and set  $m := m_0 + 1$  for the sequence  $m_0, \dots, m_{k-1}$  defined inductively by  $m_{k-1} := k(k+1)$ , and  $m_h := Em_{h+1}^H$ .

We show how to pump the runs in such a way that all pairs of indices  $i < j$  witnessing  $Cm\text{-delay}(\rho_i, \rho_j) > Dm^2$  before pumping, will witness different outputs after pumping. Consider one such pair  $(i, j)$ , with  $i < j$ , such that  $Cm\text{-delay}(\rho_i, \rho_j) > Dm^2$ , so in particular,  $\text{out}(\rho_i) = \text{out}(\rho_j)$  (if there is no such pair, then all runs have pairwise different outputs, and so we are already done). We apply Lemma 16 and obtain a set  $I_{i,j,0}$  of  $m = m_0 + 1$  positions such that each interval  $L = [\ell, \ell']$  with  $\ell, \ell' \in I_{i,j,0}$  is a loop on both  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_j$ , and:

$$\text{out}(\text{pump}_L^2(\rho_i)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_L^2(\rho_j)). \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>We remark that the notation and the actual bounds here differ from the original presentation of [20], mainly due to the fact that here we manipulate runs with explicit states and loops with idempotent skeletons. In particular, the parameters  $C, D, m$  here correspond respectively to the values  $kE^2, \ell E^4, CE^2$  with  $k, \ell, C$  as in [20, Lemma 6], and  $E$  as in our Lemma 9.

Then, by repeatedly using Lemma 9, we derive the existence of sets  $I_{i,j,k-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_{i,j,1} \subseteq I_{i,j,0}$  with  $|I_{i,j,h}| = m_h + 1$  such that each interval  $L = [\ell, \ell']$  with  $\ell, \ell' \in I_{i,j,h}$  is a loop on  $\rho_i, \rho_j$ , and  $h$  further runs from  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$  (our definition of  $m$  from the beginning of the proof is tailored to this repeated application of Lemma 9, because  $|I_{i,j,h}| = m_h + 1 = Em_{h+1}^H + 1$ ). In particular, all intervals with endpoints in  $I_{i,j,k-1}$  are loops on all the  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$ .

In this way, for each pair  $i < j$  such that  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_j$  have large **delay**, we obtain  $k(k+1)$  adjacent intervals that are loops on all runs and that satisfy the pumping property (3) from above.

As there are at most  $k(k+1)$  pairs of runs, we can now choose from the sets of intervals that we have prepared one interval  $L_{i,j}$  for each pair  $i < j$  with  $Cm\text{-delay}(\rho_i, \rho_j) > Dm^2$ , in such a way that all the chosen intervals are pairwise disjoint (for example, we could do so by always picking among the remaining intervals the one with the left-most right border, and then removing all intervals that intersect this one). The selected intervals  $L_{i,j}$  thus have the following properties:

1.  $L_{i,j}$  is a loop on all runs  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$ ,
2.  $L_{i,j}$  is disjoint from every other interval  $L_{i',j'}$ ,
3.  $\text{out}(\text{pump}_{L_{i,j}}^2(\rho_i)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_{L_{i,j}}^2(\rho_j))$ .

If a pair  $i < j$  of runs is such that  $\text{out}(\rho_i) \neq \text{out}(\rho_j)$ , then we set  $L_{i,j}$  as an empty loop.

Now, let  $\bar{L} = (L_{i,j})_{0 \leq i < j \leq k}$  be the tuple of chosen intervals, and consider the following system of word inequalities with formal parameters  $(\mathbf{x}_{i,j})_{0 \leq i < j \leq k} =: \bar{\mathbf{x}}$ :

$$\text{for all } 0 \leq i < j \leq k, \quad \text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho_i)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_{\bar{L}}^{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\rho_j)).$$

Here, the value of the formal parameter  $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$  determines how often the loop  $L_{i,j}$  is pumped. By Corollary 11, this corresponds to a word inequality in the parameters  $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$ .

Note that there is one such inequality for each pair of runs  $\rho_i, \rho_j$  with  $0 \leq i < j \leq k$ . By the choice of the intervals in  $\bar{L}$ , each of the inequalities is satisfiable: indeed, the inequality for  $\rho_i, \rho_j$  is satisfied by letting  $\mathbf{x}_{i',j'} = 1$  if  $i' \neq i$  or  $j' \neq j$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_{i,j} = 2$  otherwise.

By Corollary 13, the system of inequalities is also satisfiable with a tuple  $\bar{n} = (n_{i,j})_{0 \leq i < j \leq k}$  of numbers, as claimed in the lemma.  $\square$

### 3 The Decomposition Theorem

This section is devoted to the proof of the Decomposition Theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $k$ -valued SST can be effectively decomposed into a union of  $k$  single-valued (or even deterministic) SSTs. The complexity of the construction is elementary.*

Our proof relies on the notion of *cover* of an SST, which is reminiscent of the so-called ‘‘lag-separation covering’’ construction [17, 39]. Intuitively, given an SST  $T$  and two integers  $C, D \in \mathbb{N}$ , we construct an SST  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  that is equivalent to  $T$ , yet for each input  $u$  it only admits pairs of accepting runs with different outputs or  $C$ -delay larger than  $D$ .

**Proposition 18.** *Given an SST  $T$  and two numbers  $C, D$ , one can compute an SST called  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  such that*

1.  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  is equivalent to  $T$ ;
2. for every two accepting runs  $\rho \neq \rho'$  of  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  having the same input, either  $\text{out}(\rho) \neq \text{out}(\rho')$  or  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') > D$ ;
3. every accepting run of  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  can be projected onto an accepting run of  $T$ .

*Proof.* We order the set of **accepting runs** of  $T$  lexicographically, and we get rid of all the **runs** for which there exists a lexicographically smaller **run** with the same **input**, the same **output**, and small **delay**. Since all these conditions are encoded by regular languages, the remaining set of **runs** is also regular, and this can be used to construct an SST  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  that satisfies the required properties.

We now give more details about this construction. Let  $R$  denote the set of all **accepting runs** of  $T$ . Remark that  $R$  is a language over the alphabet consisting of transitions of  $T$ , and it is recognised by the underlying automaton of  $T$ , so it is regular. Let

$$\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R) = \{\rho \in R \mid \nexists \rho' \in R. \rho' < \rho \wedge C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D\}.$$

Recall that the delay is only defined for **accepting runs** with same **input** and same **output**, so  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D$  implies that  $\text{in}(\rho) = \text{in}(\rho')$  and  $\text{out}(\rho) = \text{out}(\rho')$ . We show that

- A)  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$  is a regular subset of  $R$ ;
- B)  $\{(\text{in}(\rho), \text{out}(\rho)) \mid \rho \in \text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)\} = \{(\text{in}(\rho), \text{out}(\rho)) \mid \rho \in R\}$ ;
- C) for every pair of runs  $\rho, \rho' \in \text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$  over the same **input**, either  $\text{out}(\rho) \neq \text{out}(\rho')$  or  $C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') > D$ .

Before proving these properties, let us show how to use them to conclude the proof of the proposition:

We start with a DFA  $A$  recognizing  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$ , whose existence is guaranteed by Property A). Note that the transitions of  $A$  are of the form  $(q, (s, a, \alpha, s'), q')$ , where  $(s, a, \alpha, s')$  is a transition of  $T$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that the source state  $q$  of an  $A$ -transition determines the source state  $s$  of the corresponding  $T$ -transition, and similarly for the target states  $q'$  and  $s'$ . Thanks to this, we can turn  $A$  into the desired SST  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  by simply projecting away the  $T$ -states from the  $T$ -transitions, namely, by replacing every transition  $(q, (s, a, \alpha, s'), q')$  with  $(q, a, \alpha, q')$ . To complete the construction, we observe that if the state  $q'$  is final in  $A$ , then the corresponding state  $s'$  is also final in  $T$  (this is because  $A$  recognizes only **accepting runs** of  $T$ ). Accordingly, we can define the **final update** of  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  so that it maps any final state  $q'$  of  $A$  to the **final update**  $\Omega(s')$ , as determined by the corresponding final state  $s'$  in  $T$ . Finally, thanks to Properties B) and C), the SST  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  constructed in this way clearly satisfies the properties claimed in the proposition.

Let us now prove Properties A)–C).

**PROOF OF PROPERTY A).** Note that  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$  is obtained by combining the relations  $R$ ,  $\{(\rho, \rho') \mid \rho' < \rho\}$ , and  $\{(\rho, \rho') \mid C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D\}$  using the operations of intersection, projection, and complement. Also recall that  $R$  can be regarded a regular language, and that  $\{(\rho, \rho') \mid \rho' < \rho\}$  and  $\{(\rho, \rho') \mid C\text{-delay}(\rho, \rho') \leq D\}$  are **automatic relations** (for the latter one uses Lemma 15). It is also a standard result (cf. [27, 32, 8]) that **automatic relations** are closed under intersection, projection, and complement. From this it follows that  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$  is a regular language.

**PROOF OF PROPERTY B).** As  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R) \subseteq R$ , the left-to-right inclusion is immediate. To prove the converse inclusion, consider an **input-output** pair  $(u, v)$  in the right hand-side of the equation, namely,  $(u, v)$  is a pair in the relation realised by  $T$ . Let  $\rho$  be the lexicographically least **accepting run** of  $T$  such that  $\text{in}(\rho) = u$  and  $\text{out}(\rho) = v$ . By construction,  $\rho \in \text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$  and hence  $(u, v)$  also belongs to the left hand-side of the equation.

**PROOF OF PROPERTY C).** This holds trivially by the definition of  $\text{Sep}_{C,D}(R)$ . □

We can now present the missing ingredients of the decomposition result. Proposition 19 below shows that, for suitable choices of  $C$  and  $D$  that depend on the **valuedness** of  $T$ ,  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  turns out to be  $k$ -ambiguous.

This will enable the decomposition result via a classical technique that decomposes any  $k$ -ambiguous automaton/transducer into a union of  $k$  unambiguous ones (see Proposition 20 further below).

**Proposition 19.** *Let  $T$  be a  $k$ -valued SST and let  $C, D, m$  be as in Lemma 17 (note that  $m$  depends on  $k$ ). The SST  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  is  $k$ -ambiguous.*

*Proof.* We prove the contrapositive of the statement. Assume that  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  is not  $k$ -ambiguous, that is, it admits  $k + 1$  accepting runs  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$  on the same input. Recall from Proposition 18 that for all  $0 \leq i < j \leq k$ , either  $\text{out}(\rho_i) \neq \text{out}(\rho_j)$  or  $Cm\text{-delay}(\rho_i, \rho_j) > Dm^2$ . By Lemma 17 we can find pumped versions of the runs  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_k$  that have all the same input but have pairwise different outputs, and thus  $T$  is not  $k$ -valued.  $\square$

**Proposition 20.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $k$ -ambiguous SST can be decomposed into a union of  $k$  unambiguous SSTs.*


*Proof.* The decomposition is done via a classical technique applicable to  $k$ -ambiguous NFA and, by extension, to all variants of automata and transducers (see [31, 38]). More precisely, decomposing a  $k$ -ambiguous NFA into a union of  $k$  unambiguous NFA is done by ordering runs lexicographically and by letting the  $i$ -th NFA in the decomposition guess the  $i$ -th accepting run on a given input (if it exists). Since the lexicographic order is a regular property of pairs of runs, it is easy to track all smaller runs.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** We now have all the ingredients to prove Theorem 1, which directly follows from Propositions 19 and 20, and the fact that unambiguous SSTs can be determinized [2].  $\square$

## 4 Finite valuedness

We characterize finite valuedness of SSTs by excluding certain types of substructures. Our characterization has strong analogies with the characterization of finite valuedness for one-way transducers, where the excluded substructures have the shape of a “W” and are therefore called *W-patterns* (cf. [17]).<sup>4</sup>

**Definition 2.** *A W-pattern is a substructure of an SST consisting of states  $q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, r_3$ , and some initial and final states, that are connected by runs as in the diagram*



where a notation like  $\rho : u' / \mu$  describes a run named  $\rho$  that consumes an input  $u'$  and produces an update  $\mu$ . Moreover, the cyclic runs  $\rho_1'', \rho_2'', \rho_3'', \rho_1' \rho_1'' \rho_1'''$ ,  $\rho_2' \rho_2'' \rho_2'''$ , and  $\rho_3' \rho_3'' \rho_3'''$  are required to be loops, namely, their updates must have idempotent skeletons.

An important constraint of the above definition is that the small loops at states  $r_1, r_2, r_3$  consume the same input, i.e.  $v''$ , and, similarly, the big loops at  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , as well as the runs from  $q_1$  to  $q_2$ , consume the same set of inputs, i.e.  $v' (v'')^* v'''$ .

<sup>4</sup>In [17] there were also other substructures excluded, which however can be seen as degenerate cases of W-patterns.

Given a  $W$ -pattern  $P$  and a positive natural number  $x$ , we construct the following runs by composing together copies of the runs of the diagram of Definition 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{lft}_P^x &= \rho'_1(\rho''_1)^x \rho'''_1 \\ \text{mid}_P^x &= \rho'_2(\rho''_2)^x \rho'''_2 \\ \text{rgt}_P^x &= \rho'_3(\rho''_3)^x \rho'''_3.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, given a sequence  $s = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, \underline{x_i}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$  of positive numbers with exactly one element underlined (we call such a sequence a *marked sequence*), we define the *accepting run*

$$\text{run}_P(s) = \rho_0 \underbrace{\text{lft}_P^{x_1} \text{lft}_P^{x_2} \dots \text{lft}_P^{x_{i-1}}}_{\text{loops at } q_1} \text{mid}_P^{x_i} \underbrace{\text{rgt}_P^{x_{i+1}} \text{rgt}_P^{x_{i+2}} \dots \text{rgt}_P^{x_n}}_{\text{loops at } q_2} \rho_4.$$

For each *marked sequence*  $s = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \underline{x_i}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $\text{run}_P(s)$  consumes the input  $u v'(v'')^{x_1} v''' \dots v'(v'')^{x_n} v''' w$  and produces an output of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\text{out}(\text{run}_P(s)) &= (\iota \alpha \beta'(\beta'')^{x_1} \beta''' \dots \beta'(\beta'')^{x_{i-1}} \beta''' \\ &\quad \gamma'(\gamma'')^{x_i} \gamma''' \\ &\quad \eta'(\eta'')^{x_{i+1}} \eta''' \dots \eta'(\eta'')^{x_n} \eta''' \omega \omega')(X_1)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\iota$  is the initial update and  $\omega'$  is the final update determined by the final state of  $\text{run}_P(s)$ . Note that, differently from the output, the input only depends on the *unmarked sequence*, and thus a  $W$ -pattern can have accepting runs that consume the same input and produce arbitrarily many different outputs. As an example, consider a  $W$ -pattern as in Definition 2, where  $\gamma''$  is the only update that produces output symbols – say  $\gamma''$  appends letter  $c$  to the right of the unique variable. Further suppose that  $u = w = \varepsilon$ ,  $v' = v''' = a$ , and  $v'' = b$ . So, on input  $(aba)(ab^2a) \dots (ab^na)$ , this  $W$ -pattern produces  $n$  different outputs:  $c, c^2, \dots, c^n$ . The definition and the lemma below generalize this example.

**Definition 3.** A  $W$ -pattern  $P$  is called *divergent* if there exists a 5-tuple of numbers  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  for which the two runs  $\text{run}_P((n_1, n_2, n_3, \underline{n_4}, n_5))$  and  $\text{run}_P((n_1, \underline{n_2}, n_3, n_4, n_5))$  produce different outputs (remark that the runs consume the same input). It is called *simply divergent* if in addition  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5 \in \{1, 2\}$ .

**Theorem 21.** An SST is finite-valued iff it does not admit a simply divergent  $W$ -pattern.

The two implications of the theorem are shown in Sections 4.2 and 4.3; effectiveness of the characterization is shown in the next section.

## 4.1 Effectiveness of finite valuedness

We prove that the characterization of finite valuedness in terms of absence of simply divergent  $W$ -patterns (Theorem 21) is effective, and yields a PSPACE decision procedure. We also prove that the equivalence problem for deterministic SSTs, known to be in PSPACE, is polynomially reducible to the finite valuedness problem. Despite recent efforts by the community to better understand the complexity of the equivalence problem, it is unknown whether the PSPACE upper bound for equivalence (and hence for finite valuedness) can be improved, as no non-trivial lower bound is known. On the other hand, equivalence (as well as finite valuedness) turns out to be in PTIME when the number of variables is fixed [5].

The effectiveness procedure uses the following complexity result on the composition of deterministic SSTs, which is of independent interest. It is known that deterministic SSTs are closed under composition because of their equivalence to MSO transductions [2]. A precise complexity analysis of this closure property can be found in [6], but it is triply exponential. We show how to do composition with a single exponential, using results from [15].

**Proposition 22.** *Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be two deterministic SSTs realizing the functions  $f_1 : \Sigma_1^* \rightarrow \Sigma_2^*$  and  $f_2 : \Sigma_2^* \rightarrow \Sigma_3^*$ . Let  $n_i$  (resp.  $m_i$ ) be the number of states (resp. variables) of  $T_i$ , and  $M = n_1 + n_2 + m_1 + m_2$ . One can construct in time exponential in  $M$  and polynomial in  $|\Sigma_1| + |\Sigma_2| + |\Sigma_3|$  a deterministic SST realizing  $f_1 \circ f_2$ , with exponentially many states and polynomially many variables in  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Each  $T_i$  can be converted in polynomial time into an equivalent two-way transducer that is *reversible*, namely, both deterministic and co-deterministic [15]. Again by [15], reversible two-way transducers can be composed in polynomial time, yielding a reversible two-way transducer  $S$  realizing  $f_1 \circ f_2$ , and having polynomially many states in  $M$ . Finally, it suffices to convert  $S$  back to a deterministic SST, which can be done in time exponential in the number of states of  $S$  and polynomial in the size of the alphabets. This yields a deterministic SST with exponentially many states and polynomially many variables in  $M$  (see e.g. [33, 16]).  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** *Given any SST  $T$ , we can decide in PSPACE if  $T$  is finite-valued, and in PTIME if the number of variables is fixed. Moreover, this problem is at least as hard as the equivalence problem for deterministic SSTs.*

*Proof.* We start with an overview of the proof. By Theorem 21, it suffices to decide whether a given SST  $T$  admits a simply divergent W-pattern. Let us fix some tuple  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_5) \in \{1, 2\}^5$ . We construct an SST  $T_{\bar{x}}$  which is not single-valued iff  $T$  has a W-pattern which is simply divergent for  $\bar{x}$ . Since checking single-valuedness of SST is decidable [5], we can decide finite valuedness of  $T$  by solving single-valuedness problems for all SST  $T_{\bar{x}}$ , for all tuples  $\bar{x} \in \{1, 2\}^5$ . Intuitively, we exhibit an encoding of W-patterns  $P$  as words  $u_P$ , and show that the set of such encodings forms a regular language. The encoding  $u_P$  informally consists of the runs that form the W-pattern  $P$ , and some of these runs are overlapped to be able to check that they are on the same input. Accordingly, the SST  $T_{\bar{x}}$  will take as input such an encoding  $u_P$  and produce as outputs the two words  $\text{out}(\text{run}_P(s))$  and  $\text{out}(\text{run}_P(s'))$ , where  $s = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \underline{x}_4, x_5)$  and  $s' = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ . To achieve this,  $T_{\bar{x}}$  can consume the input  $u_P$  while iterating the encoded runs as prescribed by  $s$  or  $s'$  and simulating the transitions to construct the appropriate outputs. Finally, an analysis of the size of  $T_{\bar{x}}$  and of the algorithm from [5] for checking single-valuedness gives the PSPACE upper bound.

**Detailed reduction** We now explain in detail the reduction to the single-valuedness problem. We will then show how to derive the PSPACE upper bound by inspecting the decidability proof for single-valuedness.

Let  $T = (\Sigma, \mathcal{X}, Q, Q_{\text{init}}, Q_{\text{final}}, \Omega, \Delta)$  be the given SST and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of all W-patterns of  $T$ . We first show that  $\mathcal{P}$  is a regular set, modulo some well-chosen encodings of W-patterns as words. Recall that a W-pattern consists of a tuple of runs  $P = (\rho_0, \rho'_1, \rho''_1, \rho'''_1, \rho'_2, \rho''_2, \rho'''_2, \rho'_3, \rho''_3, \rho'''_3, \rho_4)$ , connected as in the diagram of Definition 2. Note that some of those runs share a common input (e.g.  $\rho'_1, \rho''_2, \rho'''_3$  share the input  $v''$ ). Therefore, we cannot simply encode  $P$  as the sequence of runs  $\rho_0, \rho'_1, \dots$ , as otherwise regularity would be lost. Instead, in the encoding we overlap groups of runs over the same input, precisely, the group  $\{\rho'_1, \rho'_2, \rho'_3\}$  on input  $v'$ , the group  $\{\rho''_1, \rho''_2, \rho''_3\}$  on input  $v''$ , and the group  $\{\rho'''_1, \rho'''_2, \rho'''_3\}$  on input  $v'''$ . Formally, this is done by taking the convolution of the runs in each group, which results in a word over the alphabet  $\Delta^3$ . Accordingly,  $P$  is encoded as the word

$$u_P = \rho_0 \# (\rho'_1 \otimes \rho'_2 \otimes \rho'_3) \# (\rho''_1 \otimes \rho''_2 \otimes \rho''_3) \# (\rho'''_1 \otimes \rho'''_2 \otimes \rho'''_3) \# \rho_4$$

where  $\#$  is a fresh separator. The language  $L_{\mathcal{P}} = \{u_P \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , consisting of all encodings of W-patterns, is easily seen to be regular, recognizable by some automaton  $A_{\mathcal{P}}$  which checks that runs forming each convolution share the same input and verify skeleton idempotency (recall that skeletons form a finite monoid). The number of states of the automaton  $A_{\mathcal{P}}$  turns out to be polynomial in the number of states of  $T$  and in the size of the skeleton monoid, which in turn is exponential in the number of variables.

Next, we construct the SST  $T_{\bar{x}}$  as the disjoint union of two deterministic SSTs  $T_s$  and  $T_{s'}$ , where  $s = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \underline{x}_4, x_5)$  and  $s' = (x_1, \underline{x}_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ . We only describe  $T_s$ , as the construction of  $T_{s'}$  is similar. The SST  $T_s$  is obtained as a suitable restriction of the composition of two deterministic SSTs  $T_{\text{iter}}^s$  and  $T_{\text{exec}}$ , which respectively iterate the runs as prescribed by  $s$  and execute the transitions read as input. When fed

with the encoding  $u_P$  of a **W-pattern**,  $T_{\text{iter}}^s$  needs to output  $\text{run}_P(s) \in \Delta^*$ . More precisely, it takes as input a word of the form  $\rho_0 \# (\rho'_1 \otimes \rho'_2 \otimes \rho'_3) \# (\rho''_1 \otimes \rho''_2 \otimes \rho''_3) \# (\rho'''_1 \otimes \rho'''_2 \otimes \rho'''_3) \# \rho_4$  and produces as output

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_0 \ \rho'_1 (\rho''_1)^{x_1} \rho'''_1 \ \rho'_1 (\rho''_1)^{x_2} \rho'''_1 \ \rho'_1 (\rho''_1)^{x_3} \rho'''_1 \\ & \rho'_2 (\rho''_2)^{x_4} \rho'''_2 \\ & \rho'_3 (\rho''_3)^{x_5} \rho'''_3 \ \rho_4. \end{aligned}$$

The SST  $T_{\text{iter}}^s$  uses one variable for each non-iterated run (e.g. for  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho'_1$ ),  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3$  variables to store copies of  $\rho''_1$ ,  $x_4$  variables to store copies of  $\rho''_2$ , and  $x_5$  variables to store copies of  $\rho''_3$ , and eventually outputs the concatenation of all these variables to obtain  $\text{run}_P(s)$ . Note that  $T_{\text{iter}}^s$  does not need to check that the input is a well-formed encoding (this is done later when constructing  $T_s$ ), so the number of its states and variables is bounded by a constant; on the other hand, the input alphabet, consisting of transitions of  $T$ , is polynomial in the size of  $T$ .

The construction of  $T_{\text{exec}}$  is straightforward: it just executes the transitions it reads along the input, thus simulating a run of  $T$ . Hence  $T_{\text{exec}}$  has a single state and the same number of variables as  $T$ . Its alphabet is linear in the size of  $T$ .

Now,  $T_s$  is obtained from the composition  $T_{\text{exec}} \circ T_{\text{iter}}^s$  by restricting the input domain to  $\mathcal{P}$ . It is well-known that **deterministic SST** are closed under composition and regular domain restriction [2]. By the above constructions, we have

$$T_{\bar{x}}(u_P) = T_s(u_P) \cup T_{s'}(u_P) = \{\text{out}(\text{run}_P(s)) \cup \{\text{out}(\text{run}_P(s'))\}\}$$

and hence  $T$  contains a **W-pattern** that is simply divergent for  $\bar{x}$  iff  $T_{\bar{x}}$  is not **single-valued**. This already implies the decidability of the existence of a simply divergent **W-pattern** in  $T$ , and hence by Theorem 21, of **finite valuedness**.

**Complexity analysis** Let us now analyse the complexity in detail. This requires first estimating the size of  $T_{\bar{x}}$ . Let  $n_T$  resp.  $m_T$  be the number of states of  $T$ , resp. its number of variables. From the previous bounds on the sizes of  $T_{\text{exec}}$  and  $T_{\text{iter}}^s$  and Proposition 22, we derive that the number of states and variables of  $T_{\text{exec}} \circ T_{\text{iter}}^s$  is polynomial in both  $n_T$  and  $m_T$ . Further, restricting the domain to  $\mathcal{P}$  is done via a product with the automaton  $A_{\mathcal{P}}$ , whose size is polynomial in  $n_T$  and exponential in  $m_T$ . Summing up, the number of states of  $T_s$  is exponential in  $m_T$ , and polynomial in  $n_T$ . Its number of variables is polynomial in both  $n_T$  and  $m_T$ . And so do  $T_{s'}$  and  $T_{\bar{x}}$ .

As explained in [5], checking **single-valuedness** of SST reduces to checking non-emptiness of a 1-reversal 2-counter machine of size exponential in the number of variables and polynomial in the number of states. This is fortunate, since it allows us to conclude that checking **single-valuedness** of  $T_{\bar{x}}$  reduces to checking non-emptiness of a 1-reversal 2-counter machine of size just exponential in the number of variables of  $T$ . The PSPACE upper bound (and the PTIME upper bound for a fixed number of variables) now follow by recalling that non-emptiness of counter machines with fixed numbers of reversals and counters is in NLOGSPACE [25].

**Lower bound** For the lower bound, consider two **deterministic SST**  $T_1, T_2$  over some alphabet  $\Sigma$  with same domain  $D$ . Domain equivalence can be tested in PTIME because  $T_1, T_2$  are **deterministic**. Consider a fresh symbol  $\# \notin \Sigma$ , and the relation

$$R = \left\{ (u_1 \# \dots \# u_n, T_{i_1}(u_1) \# \dots \# T_{i_n}(u_n)) \mid \begin{array}{l} u_i \in D, n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ i_1, \dots, i_n \in \{1, 2\} \end{array} \right\}$$

It is easily seen that  $R$  is realizable by a (non-deterministic) SST. We claim that  $R$  is **finite-valued** iff it is **single-valued**, iff  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are **equivalent**. If  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are **equivalent**, then  $T_1(u_j) = T_2(u_j)$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , hence  $R$  is **single-valued**, and so **finite-valued**. Conversely, if  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are not **equivalent**, then  $T_1(u) \neq T_2(u)$  for some  $u \in D$ , and the family of inputs  $(u\#)^n u$ , with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , witnesses the fact that  $R$  is not **finite-valued**.  $\square$

As a corollary, we obtain an alternative proof of the following known result that was recalled in the introduction:

**Corollary 5** ([46]). *Finite valuedness of two-way transducers is decidable in PSPACE.*

*Proof.* Observe that a necessary condition for a two-way transducer to be finite-valued is that crossing sequences are bounded. More precisely, if a crossing sequence has a loop then the output of the loop must be empty, otherwise the transducer is not finite valued. Given a bound on the length of crossing sequences the standard conversion into an equivalent SST applies, see e.g. [33, 16]. This yields an SST with an exponential number of states and a linear number of variables, both in the number of states of the initial two-way transducer. Finally, we apply the algorithm of Theorem 4, and we observe that it amounts to checking emptiness of a 1-reversal 2-counter machine whose number of states is exponential in the number of states of the initial two-way transducer. We again conclude by using the NLOGSPACE algorithm for checking emptiness of such counter machines [25].  $\square$

## 4.2 A necessary condition for finite valuedness

Here we prove the contrapositive of the left-to-right implication of Theorem 21: we show that in a divergent  $W$ -pattern there exist arbitrarily many outputs produced by the same input.

**Lemma 23.** *Every SST that contains some divergent  $W$ -pattern is not finite-valued.*

*Proof.* Let us fix an SST with a divergent  $W$ -pattern  $P$ . In order to prove that the SST is not finite-valued, we show that we can construct arbitrary numbers of accepting runs of  $P$  that consume the same input and produce pairwise different outputs. To do this we will consider for some suitable  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  inequalities in the formal parameters  $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M$  (where  $1 \leq i < j \leq M$ ), and look for arbitrary large, satisfiable, subsets of such inequalities:

$$e_{M,i,j}[\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M] : \\ \text{out}(\text{run}_P(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{i-1}, \underline{\mathbf{s}}_i, \mathbf{s}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M)) \\ \neq \\ \text{out}(\text{run}_P(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{j-1}, \underline{\mathbf{s}}_j, \mathbf{s}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M)).$$

Recall that, according to the diagram of Definition 2, the number of variable occurrences before (resp. after) the underlined parameter represents the number of loops at state  $q_1$  (resp.  $q_2$ ) in a run of the  $W$ -pattern. Moreover, each variable  $\mathbf{s}_i$  before (resp. after) the underlined parameter represents the number of repetitions of the loop at  $r_1$  (resp.  $r_3$ ) within occurrences of bigger loops at  $q_1$  (resp.  $q_2$ ); similarly, the underlined variable represents the number of repetitions of the loop at  $r_2$  within the run that connects  $q_1$  to  $q_2$ . In view of this, by Corollary 11, the outputs of the runs considered in the above inequality have the format required for a word inequality with repetitions parametrized by  $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M$ .

The fact that the  $W$ -pattern  $P$  is divergent allows to find sets of satisfiable inequalities  $e_{M,i,j}$  of arbitrary large cardinality. This in turn will yield together with our word combinatorics results, arbitrary numbers of accepting runs over the same input and with pairwise different outputs.

**Claim.** *For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and a set  $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  of cardinality  $m + 1$  such that, for all  $i < j \in I$ ,  $e_{M,i,j}$  is satisfiable.*

*Proof of the claim.* Since  $P$  is a divergent  $W$ -pattern, there exist  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that

$$\text{out}(\text{run}_P(n_1, \underline{n}_2, n_3, n_4, n_5)) \neq \text{out}(\text{run}_P(n_1, n_2, n_3, \underline{n}_4, n_5)).$$

We fix such numbers  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5 \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Consider now the following inequality over the formal parameters  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ :

$$e[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}] : \begin{array}{c} \text{out}(\text{run}_P(\overbrace{n_1, n_1, \dots, n_1}^{x \text{ times}}, \underline{n_2}, \overbrace{n_3, \dots, n_3}^{y \text{ times}}, n_4, \overbrace{n_5, \dots, n_5}^{z \text{ times}})) \\ \neq \\ \text{out}(\text{run}_P(\overbrace{n_1, n_1, \dots, n_1}^{x \text{ times}}, n_2, \overbrace{n_3, \dots, n_3}^{y \text{ times}}, \underline{n_4}, \overbrace{n_5, \dots, n_5}^{z \text{ times}})). \end{array}$$

Note that every instance of  $e[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]$  with concrete values  $x, y, z$  is also an instance of  $e_{M,i,j}$ , where  $M = x + y + z + 2$ ,  $i = x + 1$ ,  $j = x + y + 2$ , and all parameters  $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M$  are instantiated with values from  $\{n_1, \dots, n_5\}$ . Moreover, as the parameters in  $e[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]$  determine the number of repetitions of  $n_1, n_3, n_5$ , which in their turn correspond to pumping loops at  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , by Corollary 11, the outputs of the considered runs have the format required for a word inequality with repetitions parametrized by  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ .

Since  $e[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]$  is satisfiable (e.g. with  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} = 1$ ), Corollary 14 implies that

$$\begin{array}{c} \exists \ell_y \forall h_y \exists \ell_x \forall h_x \exists \ell_z \forall h_z \\ \underbrace{[\ell_x, h_x]}_{\text{values for } \mathbf{x}} \times \underbrace{[\ell_y, h_y]}_{\text{values for } \mathbf{y}} \times \underbrace{[\ell_z, h_z]}_{\text{values for } \mathbf{z}} \subseteq \text{Sols}(e). \end{array}$$

Note that we start by quantifying over  $\ell_y$  and not  $\ell_x$  (Corollary 14 is invariant with respect to the parameter order)<sup>5</sup>. This particular order ensures that for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist three integers  $\ell_x, \ell_x + 2m\ell_y, \ell_z > 0$  such that

$$[\ell_x, \ell_x + 2m\ell_y] \times [\ell_y, 2m\ell_y] \times [\ell_z, \ell_z + 2m\ell_y] \subseteq \text{Sols}(e). \quad (4)$$

Further note that  $h_y = 2m\ell_y$  depends only on  $\ell_y$ , while  $h_x = \ell_x + 2m\ell_y$  depends on both  $\ell_x$  and  $\ell_y$ .

We can now prove the claim by letting  $M = \ell_x + 2m\ell_y + \ell_z + 1$  and  $I = \{\ell_x + 2\lambda\ell_y + 1 \mid 0 \leq \lambda \leq m\}$ . Indeed, the gap between two consecutive values of  $I$  equals  $2\ell_y$ , and for every  $i < j \in I$  we get

$$\begin{array}{lcl} i - 1 & \in & [\ell_x, \ell_x + 2(m - 1)\ell_y] \subseteq [\ell_x, \ell_x + 2m\ell_y] \\ j - i - 1 & \in & [2\ell_y - 1, 2m\ell_y - 1] \subseteq [\ell_y, 2m\ell_y] \\ M - j & \in & [\ell_z, \ell_z + 2(m - 1)\ell_y] \subseteq [\ell_z, \ell_z + 2m\ell_y]. \end{array}$$

Thus, by Equation (4),  $(i - 1, j - i - 1, M - j) \in \text{Sols}(e)$ . This solution of  $e$  corresponds to the instance of  $e_{M,i,j}$  with the values for the formal parameters  $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_M$  defined by

$$\mathbf{s}_h = \begin{cases} n_1 & \text{for every } 1 \leq h \leq i - 1, \\ n_2 & \text{for } h = i, \\ n_3 & \text{for every } i + 1 \leq h \leq j - 1, \\ n_4 & \text{for } h = j, \\ n_5 & \text{for every } j + 1 \leq h \leq M. \end{cases}$$

Hence,  $e_{M,i,j}$  is satisfiable for all  $i < j \in I$ , as claimed.  $\square$

We can now conclude the proof of the lemma using the above claim: Corollary 13 tells us that any system of word inequalities is satisfiable when every word inequality in it is so. Using this and the above claim, we derive that for every  $m$  there exist  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that, for all  $i < j \in I$  (with  $I$  as in the claim),  $e_{M,i,j}[t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M]$  holds. For every  $h \in I$ , let

$$\rho_h = \text{run}_P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{h-1}, \underline{t_h}, t_{h+1}, \dots, t_M).$$

Note that all runs  $\rho_h$ , for  $h \in I$ , consume the same input, since they all correspond to the same unmarked sequence  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M)$ . However, they produce pairwise different outputs, because for every  $i < j \in I$ , the tuple  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M)$  is a solution of  $e_{M,i,j}$ . Since  $|I| = m$  can be chosen arbitrarily, the transducer is not finitely valued.  $\square$


<sup>5</sup>The reader may compare this with the example given before Def. 3.

### 4.3 A sufficient condition for finite valuedness

We finally prove that an SST with no simply divergent  $W$ -pattern is finite-valued. The proof relies on two crucial results.

The first result is a characterization of finite ambiguity for SSTs, which is easily derived from a prior characterization of finite ambiguity for finite state automata [34, 29, 45]:

**Definition 4.** A *dumbbell* is a substructure of an SST consisting of states  $q_1, q_2$  connected by runs as in the diagram




where the runs  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_3$  are loops (in particular, they produce updates with idempotent skeletons) and at least two among the runs  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$  that consume the same input  $v$  are distinct.

**Lemma 24.** An SST is finitely-ambiguous iff it does not contain any dumbbell.

*Proof.* Let  $T = (\Sigma, \mathcal{X}, Q, Q_{\text{init}}, Q_{\text{final}}, \Omega, \Delta)$  be an SST. By projecting away the updates on the transitions we obtain from  $T$  a *multiset finite state automaton*  $A$ . Formally,  $A = (\Sigma, Q_{\text{init}}, Q_{\text{final}}, \Delta')$ , where  $\Delta'$  is the multiset containing one occurrence of a triple  $(q, a, q')$  for each transition of the form  $(q, a, \alpha, q')$  in  $\Delta$ . Note that a multiset automaton can admit several occurrences of the same (accepting) run. Accordingly, the notion of finite ambiguity for  $A$  requires the existence of a uniform bound to the number of occurrences of accepting runs of  $A$  on the same input. We also remark that multiset automata are essentially the same as weighted automata over the semiring of natural numbers (the weight of a transition being its number of occurrences), with only a difference in terminology where finite ambiguity in multiset automata corresponds to finite valuedness in weighted automata.

Given the above construction of  $A$  from  $T$ , one can verify by induction on  $|u|$  that the number of occurrences of accepting runs of  $A$  on  $u$  coincides with the number of accepting runs of  $T$  on  $u$ . This means that  $A$  is finitely-ambiguous iff  $T$  is finitely-ambiguous.

Finally, we recall the characterizations of finite ambiguity from [34, 29, 45] (see in particular Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 2.6 from [34]). For short, their results directly imply that a multiset automaton is finitely ambiguous iff it does not contain a *plain dumbbell*, namely, a substructure of the form



where at least two among  $\rho'_1, \rho'_2, \rho'_3$  are distinct runs.

This almost concludes the proof of the lemma, since any dumbbell of  $T$  can be projected into a plain dumbbell of  $A$ . The converse implication, however, is not completely straightforward. The reason is that the cyclic runs of a plain dumbbell in  $A$  do not necessarily correspond to loops in the SST  $T$ , as the runs need not produce updates with idempotent skeletons. Nonetheless, we can reason as follows. Suppose that  $A$  contains a plain dumbbell, with occurrences of runs  $\rho'_0, \rho'_1, \rho'_2, \rho'_3, \rho'_4$  as depicted above. Let  $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4$  be the corresponding runs in  $T$ , and let  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta, \omega$  be their induced updates. Further let  $n$  be a large enough number such that  $\beta^n$  and  $\eta^n$  have idempotent skeletons (such an  $n$  always exists since the skeleton monoid is finite). Now consider the substructure in  $T$  given by the runs  $\rho_0 = \rho'_0$ ,  $\rho_1 = (\rho'_1)^n$ ,  $\rho_2 = (\rho'_1)^{n-1} \rho'_2$ ,  $\rho_3 = (\rho'_3)^n$ , and  $\rho_4 = \rho'_4$ . This substructure satisfies precisely the definition of dumbbell for the SST  $T$ .  $\square$

The second ingredient for the proof of the right-to-left implication of Theorem 21 uses once more the cover construction described in Proposition 18. More precisely, in Lemma 25 below we show that if an SST  $T$  has no **simply divergent W-pattern**, then, for some well chosen values  $C, D, m$ , the SST  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  contains no **dumbbell**. Before proving the lemma, let us show how it can be used to establish the right-to-left implication of Theorem 21.

**Proof of Theorem 21** By Lemma 24, if  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  has no **dumbbell**, then it is **finitely-ambiguous**, and hence it associates with each **input** a uniformly bounded number of **outputs**. In particular,  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  is **finite-valued**, and since it is also equivalent to  $T$ , then  $T$  is **finite-valued** too.  $\square$

**Lemma 25.** *Given an SST  $T$ , one can compute three numbers  $C, D$ , and  $m$  such that if  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  contains a **dumbbell**, then  $T$  contains a **simply divergent W-pattern**.*

*Proof.* Intuitively, we will show that if  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  contains a **dumbbell**, then this **dumbbell** must admit two distinct **runs**  $\pi, \pi'$  that either produce different **outputs** or have large **delay**. In both cases we will be able to transform the **dumbbell** into a **simply divergent W-pattern**. For example, in the case of a large **delay**, we will rely on Lemmas 16 and 9 to identify certain **loops** in  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  that lie entirely inside occurrences of the **runs**  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_4$  of the **dumbbell**, and such that, when pumped, produce different **outputs**. From there, we will be able to expose a **simply divergent W-pattern** in  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$ , and hence in  $T$  as well.

Formally, let  $T$  be an SST, let  $C, D$  be defined as in Lemma 16, and let  $m = 7E^{H^2+H+1} + 1$ , where  $E, H$  are defined as in Lemma 9. Next, suppose that  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$  contains a **dumbbell** like the one of Definition 4, with **runs**  $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4$  that produce respectively the updates  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta, \omega$ .

Consider the following **accepting runs**, which are obtained by composing the copies of the original **runs** of the **dumbbell**, and that are different because two of  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$  have to be different:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi &= \rho_0 \rho_1 \rho_2 \rho_3 \rho_3 \rho_3 \rho_4 \\ \pi' &= \rho_0 \rho_1 \rho_1 \rho_1 \rho_2 \rho_3 \rho_4.\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

By the properties of  $\text{Cover}_{Cm, Dm^2}(T)$ , since  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  consume the same **input**, they either produce different **outputs** or have  $Cm$ -**delay** larger than  $Dm^2$ .

We first consider the case where the **outputs** are different. In this case, we can immediately witness a **simply divergent W-pattern**  $P$  by adding empty **runs** to the **dumbbell**; formally, for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , we let  $\rho'_i = \rho_i$  and  $\rho''_i = \rho'''_i = \varepsilon$ , so as to form a **W-pattern** like the one in the diagram of Definition 2, but now with  $r_1 = q_1$  and  $r_2 = r_3 = q_2$ . Using the notation introduced at the beginning of Section 4, we observe that  $\pi = \text{run}_P(1, \underline{1}, 1, 1, 1)$  and  $\pi' = \text{run}_P(1, 1, 1, \underline{1}, 1)$  — recall that the underlined number represents how many times the small **loop** at  $r_2$ , which is empty here, is repeated along the **run** from  $q_1$  to  $q_2$ , and the other numbers represent how many times the small **loops** at  $r_1$  and  $r_3$ , which are also empty here, are repeated within the occurrences of big **loops** at  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ . Since, by assumption, the **runs**  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  produce different **outputs**, the **W-pattern**  $P$  is **simply divergent**, as required.

We now consider the case where  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  have large **delay**, namely,  $Cm\text{-delay}(\pi, \pi') > Dm^2$ . In this case Lemma 16 guarantees the existence of a set  $I \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, |\pi|\}$  containing  $m$  positions in between the input letters such that, for all pairs  $i < j$  in  $I$ , the interval  $[i, j]$  is a **loop** on both  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  and satisfies

$$\text{out}(\text{pump}_{[i,j]}^2(\pi)) \neq \text{out}(\text{pump}_{[i,j]}^2(\pi')).\tag{6}$$

Next, recall from Equation (5) that  $\pi$ , and similarly  $\pi'$ , consists of seven parts, representing copies of the original **runs** of the **dumbbell** and consuming the **inputs**  $u, v, v, v, v, v, w$ . We identify these parts with the numbers  $1, \dots, 7$ . Since we defined  $m$  as  $7E^{H^2+H+1} + 1$ , there is one of these parts in which at least  $E^{H^2+H+1} + 1$  of the aforementioned positions of  $I$  occur. Let  $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$  denote the number of this part, and let  $I_p$  be a set of  $E^{H^2+H+1} + 1$  positions from  $I$  that occur entirely inside the  $p$ -th part. We conclude the proof by a further case distinction, depending on whether  $p \in \{1, 7\}$  or  $p \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$ .

**Parts 1 and 7** Let us suppose that  $p \in \{1, 7\}$ , and let  $i$  and  $j$  be two distinct positions in  $I_p$ . We let  $P$  be the **W-pattern** obtained by transforming the **dumbbell** as follows:

1. First, we **pump** either  $\rho_0$  or  $\rho_4$  depending on  $p$ :
  - If  $p = 1$ , we set  $\rho'_0 = \text{pump}_{[i,j]}^2(\rho_0)$  and  $\rho'_4 = \rho_4$ .
  - If  $p = 7$ , we set  $\rho'_4 = \text{pump}_{[i-|u v^5|, j-|u v^5|]}^2(\rho_4)$  and  $\rho'_0 = \rho_0$ .
2. Then, we add empty runs to  $\rho_1$ ,  $\rho_2$ , and  $\rho_3$ ; formally, for each  $h \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we set  $\rho'_h = \rho_h$  and  $\rho''_h = \rho'''_h = \varepsilon$ .

Now that we identified a **W-pattern**  $P$  in  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$ , we note that


$$\begin{aligned} \text{pump}_{[i,j]}^2(\pi) &= \text{run}_P(1, \underline{1}, 1, 1, 1) \\ \text{pump}_{[i,j]}^2(\pi') &= \text{run}_P(1, 1, 1, \underline{1}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

We also recall Equation 6, which states that these runs produce different **outputs**. This means that the **W-pattern**  $P$  is **simply divergent**. Finally, since the runs of  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  can be projected into runs of  $T$ , we conclude that  $T$  contains a **simply divergent W-pattern**.

**Parts 2–6** Let us suppose that  $p \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$ . Note that, in this case, the elements of  $I_p$  denote positions inside the  $p$ -th factor of the **input**  $u v v v v v w$ , which is a  $v$ . To refer directly to the positions of  $v$ , we define  $I'_p$  as the set obtained by subtracting  $|u v^{p-1}|$  from each element of  $I_p$ . Since the set  $|I'_p|$  has cardinality  $E^{H^2+H+1} + 1$ , we claim that we can find an interval with endpoints from  $I'_p$  that is a **loop** of  $\rho_1$ ,  $\rho_2$ , and  $\rho_3$ , at the same time. Specifically, we can do so via three consecutive applications of Lemma 9:

1. As  $|I'_p| = E^{H^2+H+1} + 1 = E \cdot (E^{H+1})^H + 1$ , there exists a set  $I''_p \subseteq I'_p$  of cardinality  $E^{H+1} + 1$  such that for every pair  $i < j$  in  $I''_p$ , the interval  $[i, j]$  is a **loop** of  $\rho_1$ ;
2. As  $|I''_p| = E^{H+1} + 1 = E \cdot E^H + 1$ , there exists  $I'''_p \subseteq I''_p$  of cardinality  $E + 1$  s.t. for every pair  $i < j$  in  $I'''_p$ , the interval  $[i, j]$  is a **loop** of  $\rho_2$  (and also of  $\rho_1$ , since  $i, j \in I'''_p \subseteq I''_p$ );
3. As  $|I'''_p| = E + 1 = E \cdot 1^H + 1$ , there are two positions  $i < j$  in  $I'''_p$  such that the interval  $[i, j]$  is a **loop** of  $\rho_3$  (and also of  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  since  $i, j \in I'''_p \subseteq I''_p$ ).

The diagram below summarizes the current situation: we have just managed to find an interval  $[i, j]$  that is a **loop** on all  $v$ -labelled runs  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$  of the **dumbbell** (the occurrences of this interval inside  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$  are highlighted by thick segments):



We can now expose a **W-pattern**  $P$  by merging the positions  $i$  and  $j$  inside each  $v$ -labelled run  $\rho_1$ ,  $\rho_2$ , and  $\rho_3$  of the **dumbbell**. Formally, we let  $\rho'_0 = \rho_0$ ,  $\rho'_4 = \rho_4$ , and for every  $h \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we define  $\rho'_h$ ,  $\rho''_h$ , and  $\rho'''_h$ , respectively, as the intervals  $[0, i]$ ,  $[i, j]$ , and  $[j, |v|]$  of  $\rho_h$ . Now that we have identified a **W-pattern**  $P$  inside  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$ , we remark that  $\pi = \text{run}_P(1, \underline{1}, 1, 1, 1)$  and  $\pi' = \text{run}_P(1, 1, 1, \underline{1}, 1)$ . Additionally, if we

transpose  $i$  and  $j$  from  $I'_p$  back to  $I$ , that is, if we set  $i' = i + |u v^{p-1}|$  and  $j' = j + |u v^{p-1}|$ , since both  $i'$  and  $j'$  occur in the  $p$ -th part of  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ , **pumping** the interval  $[i', j']$  in  $\pi$  (resp.  $\pi'$ ) amounts to incrementing the  $(p-1)$ -th parameter in the notation  $\text{run}_P(1, \underline{1}, 1, 1, 1)$  (resp.  $\text{run}_P(1, 1, 1, \underline{1}, 1)$ ). More precisely:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pump}_{[i', j']}^2(\pi) &= \text{run}_P(n_1, \underline{n_2}, n_3, n_4, n_5) \\ \text{pump}_{[i', j']}^2(\pi') &= \text{run}_P(n_1, n_2, n_3, \underline{n_4}, n_5) \end{aligned}$$

where each  $n_{p'}$  is either 2 or 1 depending on whether  $p' = p-1$  or not. Since Equation 6 states that these two runs produce different outputs, the **W-pattern**  $P$  is simply divergent. Finally, since the runs of  $\text{Cover}_{C,D}(T)$  can be projected into runs of  $T$ , we conclude that, also in this case,  $T$  contains a simply divergent **W-pattern**.  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

We have drawn a rather complete picture of finite-valued SSTs and answered several open questions of [5]. Regarding expressiveness, they can be decomposed as unions of deterministic SST (Theorem 1), and they are equivalent to finite-valued two-way transducers (Theorem 2), and to **finite-valued** non-deterministic MSO transductions (see Section 1). On the algorithmic side, their equivalence problem is decidable in elementary time (Theorem 3) and **finite valuedness** of SSTs is decidable in PSPACE (PTIME for a fixed number of variables), see Theorem 4. As an alternative proof to the result of [46], our results imply the PSPACE decidability of **finite valuedness** for two-way transducers (Corollary 5). Because of the effective expressiveness equivalence between SSTs and non-deterministic MSO transductions, our result also entails decidability of **finite valuedness** for the latter class.

**Further questions.** A first interesting question is how big the valuedness of an SST can be. In the classical case of one-way transducers the valuedness has been shown to be at most exponential (if finite at all) [43]. We can obtain a bound from Lemma 25, but the value is likely to be sub-optimal.

Our **equivalence** procedure relies on the decomposition of a  $k$ -valued SST into a union of  $k$  **deterministic** SSTs each of elementary size. Our construction is likely to be sub-optimal again, and so is our complexity for checking **equivalence**. On the other hand, only a PSPACE lower bound is known [35]. A better understanding of the complexity of the **equivalence** problem for (sub)classes of SSTs is a challenging question. Already for **deterministic** SSTs, **equivalence** is only known to be between NLOGSPACE and PSPACE [3].

However, beyond the **finite-valued** setting there is little hope to find a natural restriction on **valuedness** which would preserve the decidability of the **equivalence** problem. Already for one-way transducers of linear **valuedness** (i.e. where the number of outputs is linear in the **input** length), **equivalence** is undecidable, as shown through a small modification of the proof of [28].

**Deterministic** SSTs have been extended, while preserving decidability of the **equivalence** problem, in several ways: to copyful SSTs [9, 21], which allow to copy the content of variables several times, to infinite strings [7], and to trees [4]. Generalizations of these results to the **finite-valued** setting yield interesting questions. On trees, similar questions (effective **finite valuedness**, decomposition and **equivalence**) have been answered positively for bottom-up tree transducers [41].

Finally, SSTs have linear **input-to-output** growth (in the length of the strings). There is a recent trend in extending transducer models to allow polynomial growth [11, 10, 12, 18], and **finite valuedness** has not yet been studied in this context.

## References

- [1] M.H. Albert and J. Lawrence. A proof of Ehrenfeucht’s conjecture. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 41(1):121–123, 1985.

- [2] Rajeev Alur and Pavol Cerný. Expressiveness of streaming string transducers. In Kamal Lodaya and Meena Mahajan, editors, *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2010, December 15-18, 2010, Chennai, India*, volume 8 of *LIPICs*, pages 1–12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.FSTTCS.2010.1>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.FSTTCS.2010.1.
- [3] Rajeev Alur and Pavol Cerný. Streaming transducers for algorithmic verification of single-pass list-processing programs. In Thomas Ball and Mooly Sagiv, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2011, Austin, TX, USA, January 26-28, 2011*, pages 599–610. ACM, 2011. doi:10.1145/1926385.1926454.
- [4] Rajeev Alur and Loris D’Antoni. Streaming tree transducers. *J. ACM*, 64(5):31:1–31:55, 2017. doi:10.1145/3092842.
- [5] Rajeev Alur and Jyotirmoy V. Deshmukh. Nondeterministic streaming string transducers. In Luca Aceto, Monika Henzinger, and Jiri Sgall, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming - 38th International Colloquium, ICALP 2011, Zurich, Switzerland, July 4-8, 2011, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 6756 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–20. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22012-8\\_1.
- [6] Rajeev Alur, Taylor Dohmen, and Ashutosh Trivedi. Composing copyless streaming string transducers. *CoRR*, abs/2209.05448:1–21, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.05448>, arXiv:2209.05448, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2209.05448.
- [7] Rajeev Alur, Emmanuel Filiot, and Ashutosh Trivedi. Regular transformations of infinite strings. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2012, Dubrovnik, Croatia, June 25-28, 2012*, pages 65–74. IEEE Computer Society, 2012. doi:10.1109/LICS.2012.18.
- [8] Achim Blumensath and Erich Grädel. Automatic structures. In *Proceedings of the 15th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2000*, pages 51–62. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2000.
- [9] Mikolaj Bojanczyk. The hilbert method for transducer equivalence. *ACM SIGLOG News*, 6(1):5–17, 2019. doi:10.1145/3313909.3313911.
- [10] Mikolaj Bojanczyk. Transducers of polynomial growth. In Christel Baier and Dana Fisman, editors, *LICS ’22: 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Haifa, Israel, August 2 - 5, 2022*, pages 1:1–1:27. ACM, 2022. doi:10.1145/3531130.3533326.
- [11] Mikolaj Bojanczyk, Sandra Kiefer, and Nathan Lhote. String-to-string interpretations with polynomial-size output. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 106:1–106:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2019.106>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2019.106.
- [12] Mikolaj Bojańczyk. On the growth rates of polyregular functions. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–13, 2023. doi:10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175808.
- [13] Bruno Courcelle and Joost Engelfriet. *Graph Structure and Monadic Second-Order Logic - A Language-Theoretic Approach*, volume 138 of *Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [14] Karel Culik II and Juhani Karhumäki. The equivalence of finite valued transducers (on HDTOL languages) is decidable. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 47:71–84, 1986.

- [15] Luc Dartois, Paulin Fournier, Ismaël Jecker, and Nathan Lhote. On reversible transducers. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Piotr Indyk, Fabian Kuhn, and Anca Muscholl, editors, *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland*, volume 80 of *LIPICs*, pages 113:1–113:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.
- [16] Luc Dartois, Ismaël Jecker, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Aperiodic string transducers. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 29(5):801–824, 2018. doi:10.1142/S0129054118420054.
- [17] Rodrigo De Souza. *Etude structurelle des transducteurs de norme bornée*. PhD thesis, LTCI - Laboratoire Traitement et Communication de l’Information, Paris-Saclay, 2008. URL: <http://www.theses.fr/2008ENST0023/document>.
- [18] Gaëtan Douéneau-Tabot. *Optimization of string transducers*. PhD thesis, Université Paris Cité, Paris, France, 2023. URL: [https://gdoueneau.github.io/pages/DOUENEAU-TABOT\\_Optimization-transducers\\_v2.pdf](https://gdoueneau.github.io/pages/DOUENEAU-TABOT_Optimization-transducers_v2.pdf).
- [19] Joost Engelfriet and Hendrik Jan Hoogeboom. MSO definable string transductions and two-way finite-state transducers. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 2(2):216–254, 2001.
- [20] Emmanuel Filiot, Ismaël Jecker, Christof Löding, and Sarah Winter. A regular and complete notion of delay for streaming string transducers. In Petra Berenbrink, Patricia Bouyer, Anuj Dawar, and Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, editors, *40th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2023, March 7-9, 2023, Hamburg, Germany*, volume 254 of *LIPICs*, pages 32:1–32:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2023.32.
- [21] Emmanuel Filiot and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Copyful streaming string transducers. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 178(1-2):59–76, 2021. doi:10.3233/FI-2021-1998.
- [22] Patrick C. Fischer and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Multi-tape one-way nonwriting automata. *J. Comput. and System Sci.*, 2:88–101, 1968.
- [23] Victor S. Guba. Equivalence of infinite systems of equations in free groups and semigroups to finite subsystems. *Mat. Zametki*, 40(3):688–690, 1986.
- [24] Eitan M. Gurari and Oscar H. Ibarra. The complexity of decision problems for finite-turn multicounter machines. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 22(2):220–229, 1981. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(81)90028-3.
- [25] Eitan M. Gurari and Oscar H. Ibarra. The complexity of decision problems for finite-turn multicounter machines. In Shimon Even and Oded Kariv, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 8th Colloquium, Acre (Akko), Israel, July 13-17, 1981, Proceedings*, volume 115 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 495–505. Springer, 1981.
- [26] Eitan M. Gurari and Oscar H. Ibarra. A note on finite-valued and finitely ambiguous transducers. *Math. Syst. Theory*, 16(1):61–66, 1983.
- [27] Bernard R. Hodgson. Décidabilité par automate fini. *Ann. Sci. Math. Québec*, 7(3):39–57, 1983.
- [28] Oscar H. Ibarra. The unsolvability of the equivalence problem for e-free NGSMS with unary input (output) alphabet and applications. *SIAM J. of Comput.*, 7(4):524–532, 1978.
- [29] Gérard Jacob. Un algorithme calculant le cardinal, fini ou infini, des demi-groupes de matrices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(2):183–204, 1977.
- [30] Ismaël Jecker. A Ramsey theorem for finite monoids. In Markus Bläser and Benjamin Monmege, editors, *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2021, March 16-19, 2021, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, volume 187 of *LIPICs*, pages 44:1–44:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2021.44>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2021.44.

- [31] J. Howard Johnson. Do rational equivalence relations have regular cross-sections? In Wilfried Brauer, editor, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 12th Colloquium, Nafplion, Greece, July 15-19, 1985, Proceedings*, volume 194 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 300–309. Springer, 1985. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0015755>, doi:10.1007/BFb0015755.
- [32] Bakhadyr Khossainov and Anil Nerode. Automatic presentations of structures. In *Logical and Computational Complexity. Selected Papers. Logic and Computational Complexity, International Workshop LCC '94, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA, 13-16 October 1994*, volume 960 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 367–392. Springer, 1995.
- [33] Jérémy Ledent. Streaming string transducers (internship report). [https://perso.ens-lyon.fr/jeremy.ledent/internship\\_report\\_L3.pdf](https://perso.ens-lyon.fr/jeremy.ledent/internship_report_L3.pdf), 2013.
- [34] Arnaldo Mandel and Imre Simon. On finite semigroups of matrices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(2):101–111, 1977.
- [35] Anca Muscholl and Gabriele Puppis. Equivalence of finite-valued streaming string transducers is decidable. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 122:1–122:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2019.122.
- [36] Brigitte Rozoy. Outils et résultats pour les transducteurs boustrophédons. *RAIRO-Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 20(3):221–250, 1986.
- [37] Aleksi Saarela. Systems of word equations, polynomials and linear algebra: A new approach. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 47:1–14, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2015.01.005.
- [38] Jacques Sakarovitch. A construction on finite automata that has remained hidden. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 204(1-2):205–231, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(98)00040-1.
- [39] Jacques Sakarovitch and Rodrigo de Souza. On the decidability of bounded valuedness for transducers. In Edward Ochmanski and Jerzy Tyszkiewicz, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2008, 33rd International Symposium, MFCS 2008, Torun, Poland, August 25-29, 2008, Proceedings*, volume 5162 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 588–600. Springer, 2008.
- [40] Jacques Sakarovitch and Rodrigo de Souza. On the decomposition of k-valued rational relations. In Susanne Albers and Pascal Weil, editors, *STACS 2008, 25th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Bordeaux, France, February 21-23, 2008, Proceedings*, volume 1 of *LIPICs*, pages 621–632. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Germany, 2008. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2008.1324>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2008.1324.
- [41] Helmut Seidl. Equivalence of finite-valued tree transducers is decidable. *Math. Syst. Theory*, 27(4):285–346, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF01192143.
- [42] John C. Shepherdson. The reduction of two-way automata to one-way automata. *IBM J. Res. Dev.*, 3(2):198–200, 1959. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.32.0198>, doi:10.1147/RD.32.0198.
- [43] Andreas Weber. Decomposing finite-valued transducers and deciding their equivalence. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 22(1):175–202, 1993. doi:10.1137/0222014.
- [44] Andreas Weber. Decomposing a k-valued transducer into k unambiguous ones. *RAIRO-ITA*, 30(5):379–413, 1996.
- [45] Andreas Weber and Helmut Seidl. On the degree of ambiguity of finite automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 88(2):325–349, 1991. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(91)90381-B.

- [46] Di-De Yen and Hsu-Chun Yen. On the decidability of the valuedness problem for two-way finite transducers. *Inf. Comput.*, 285(Part):104870, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2022.104870>, doi:10.1016/J.IC.2022.104870.